

381. By Mr. HALE: Petition of the State of Maine, that Congress request the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service to review the present methods employed in determining conditions under which soft-shell-clam-producing areas are closed to the taking of all shellfish that go into interstate commerce, and that the study be made with the least possible delay in order to relieve the serious consequences now resulting from restrictions currently in force that hinder the complete utilization of the shellfish resources of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

382. By Mr. HOLMES: Petition of Washington State Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors with attached resolutions of Washington Wool Growers' Association and National Wool Growers' Association, commending Soil Conservation Service and its accomplishments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

383. Also, petition of the State of Washington, to set aside the area of old Fort Vancouver as a national monument; to the Committee on Public Lands.

384. Also, memorial of the State of Washington, to provide hunters for extermination of predatory animals in national parks; to the Committee on Public Lands.

385. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of Mrs. Jesse Tanner and 28 other residents of St. John, Kans., urging the enactment of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

386. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine, respectfully presenting and petitioning that Congress request the Surgeon General review present methods employed in determining conditions under which soft-shell-clam-producing areas are closed to the taking of all shellfish that go into interstate commerce; that the review be made with the least possible delay to relieve the serious consequences; that the review complete whether or not the methods of determining the sanitation of soft-shell clams and the areas involved should not be different from those used in the examination of oysters and oyster beds; and that the test shall be made by testing the clam and not by testing the water; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

387. By the SPEAKER: Petition of San Juan Bautista Council, No. 1543, Knights of Columbus, San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for extension to Puerto Rico of all legislation that may be approved against communism; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

388. Also, petition of the Free Sons of Israel, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to support of H. R. 2910 and promotion of its enactment into law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

389. Also, petition of American Association of Social Workers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to passage of legislation to permit admission of displaced persons into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

390. Also, petition of the Atlantic City Board of Trade, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the bills S. 866 and H. R. 2523; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

391. Also, petition of the delegates from the Townsend clubs of the Second Congressional District of the State of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

392. Also, petition of membership of the Orlo Vista Townsend Club, No. 1, of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for enactment of a uniform national insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

393. Also, petition of the New Port Richey Townsend Club, No. 1, of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Give us open eyes, our Father, to see the beauty all around us and to see in it Thy handiwork. Let all lovely things fill us with gladness and let them lift up our hearts in true worship.

Give us this day, O God, a strong and vivid sense that Thou art by our side. By Thy grace, let us go nowhere this day where Thou canst not come nor court any companionship that would rob us of Thine. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 28, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 28, 1947, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1009) to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site (commonly known as the Base Six property) which is located at Fort Lauderdale.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1624) to authorize payment of allowances to three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force for the use of their privately owned motor vehicles, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 736) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

"House Concurrent Resolution 33

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the twenty-fourth session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, requested to amend section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act to provide that whenever 25 or more persons holding an honorable discharge from service, during the present war, in the armed forces of the United States or from service, during the present war, in the merchant marine who were residents of Hawaii for a continuous period of not less than 5 years immediately prior to entry into such service, who have not theretofore made application under such organic act, shall make written application to the commissioner of public lands for the opening of agricultural lands for settlement in any locality or district, it shall be the duty of said commissioner to proceed expeditiously to survey and open for entry agricultural lands, whether unoccupied or under lease with the right of withdrawal, sufficient in area to provide lands for use and occupancy upon 99-year lease, by such persons, together with all persons of like qualification who shall have filed with such commissioner prior to the survey of such lands, written applications for lands for occupancy in the district designated in said applications, of 4 acres each. The land to be so opened by said commissioner shall be either the specific tract or tracts applied for or other suitable and available agricultural lands in the same geographical district, and, as far as possible, in the immediate locality of and as nearly equal to that applied for as may be available: *Provided, however,* That no leased land under cultivation shall be taken for homesteading until any crops growing thereon shall have been harvested: *And provided further,* That each lease made under such enactment shall be deemed subject to the following conditions, whether or not stipulated in the lease:

"(1) The lessee shall pay a rental of \$1 a year for the land and the lease shall be for a term of 99 years.

"(2) The lessee shall occupy and commence to use or cultivate the land as his home or farm within 1 year after the lease is made, and shall continuously so use and cultivate said land during the entire term of the lease.

"(3) The lessee shall not in any manner transfer to nor mortgage, pledge, or otherwise hold for the benefit of any other person, or agree so to transfer, mortgage, pledge, or otherwise hold, his interest in the land. Such interest shall not be subject to attachment, levy, or sale upon court process. Upon the death of the lessee his interest in the land and improvements thereon shall vest as follows:

"(a) In his widow, if he leave a widow;

"(b) If he leave no widow, in such child or children of his as he may designate by will, or upon failure of such designation, in his children in joint tenancy;

"(c) In the event that he leave no widow or children, the right to the use and occupancy of said land shall thereupon revert in the Territory.

"(4) The lessee shall pay all taxes assessed upon the land and improvements thereon

within 60 days after they become delinquent, and if he fails so to pay, the land commissioner may thereupon pay the taxes and declare the lease upon same to be forfeited and canceled, and evict the lessee therefrom.

"Upon failure to comply with any of said conditions the right to the use and occupancy of said land by said lessee shall thereupon revert in the Territory and the commissioner may take possession of the same and improvements thereon; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States of America, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America."

"House Concurrent Resolution 39

"Concurrent resolution requesting Congress to ratify and confirm act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, amending chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, relating to revenue bonds

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to ratify and confirm act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, amending section 6095 of chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, by extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered to June 30, 1949; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 287 citizens of the city of Spokane, Wash., praying for the enactment at Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 560) to prohibit the operation of gambling ships, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report (No. 147) thereon.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 29, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 736) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1176. A bill to amend section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

S. 1177. A bill to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

S. 1178. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; and

S. 1179. A bill to terminate Executive Order 9070, to reestablish the Home Loan Bank

Board, to establish a Federal Home Loan and Housing Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. BUTLER introduced Senate bill 1180, to authorize the issuance of a special series of commemorative stamps in honor of Gold Star Mothers, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia:

S. 1181. A bill for the relief of Robert F. Parks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1182. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the centennial anniversary of Osage Mission, Kansas; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. BUTLER (by request):

S. 1183. A bill to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation and for other purposes; and

S. 1184. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1185. A bill to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 1186. A bill for the relief of Thorvaldur Hliddal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1187. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code to provide for a minimum wage; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1188. A bill to provide that consideration shall be given, in establishing retention preference regulations, to employees permanently injured in line of duty, and to permit exemption of such employees from the regulations; to the Committee on Civil Service

S. 1189. A bill for the relief on Mrs. Susie E. Felmy; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

GOLD STAR MOTHERS COMMEMORATIVE STAMPS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for commemorative stamps in honor of Gold Star Mothers.

I understand that legislation along this line is not absolutely essential, since the Postmaster General could issue such stamps, if he so desired, under his present authority. The Postmaster General has declined to take such action, however, and has indicated that it would be difficult to fit this series of commemorative stamps into the production schedule of the Department this year.

I am introducing this bill in the hope that the Postmaster General will make preparations for the issuance of the stamps at the earliest practicable date.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1180) to authorize the issuance of a special series of commemorative stamps in honor of Gold Star Mothers, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

LABOR RELATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REDUCTION OF INCOME TAX—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940—AMENDMENT

Mr. MYERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 518) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens who were unable to return to the United States prior to October 14, 1946, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 1624) to authorize payment of allowances to three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force for the use of their privately owned motor vehicles, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hawkes	Myers
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Connor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hoey	Overton
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kem	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Saltinestall
Cain	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tobey
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Ninety-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, on Thursday, April 17, I met with a group of several hundred representatives of CIO unions from Pennsylvania for the

purpose of discussing pending labor legislation.

The meeting was in the best American tradition. Members of the labor delegation presented their views and urged support for the propositions which they considered in the best interests of the American workingman and the American organized-labor movement.

On my part, I made my position clear, stating what I held to be labor's rights and obligations. I sought to suggest a course of action by labor and by management which might contribute toward the establishment of industrial peace.

The meeting was a clear-cut demonstration of the right of every American to a proper hearing and to state his case frankly and openly.

The visiting delegation and myself were not in complete agreement as to the most effective method to reach the goal toward which all of us are striving. However, we met in harmony and with mutual respect for the opinions of each other.

A few days later there appeared in the Washington Observer, a daily newspaper published in my home town of Washington, Pa., a paid advertisement with this headline:

Senator MARTIN ignores will of home county.

This was followed by an attack upon me which I desire now to call to the attention of my colleagues because I feel honored that I have been singled out for this denunciation.

The advertisement was signed "Washington County Committee, Communist Party, Gabe Kish, chairman."

With brazen effrontery, this Communist and his associates presume to speak for the people of Washington County and for the thousands of decent, hard-working, patriotic members of the fine labor unions in the community which is my home.

I say to the Senate now that neither Kish nor his fellow travelers of the Communist Party committee represent labor or the community in which they conspire to stir up class hatred and prejudice, and to undermine faith in the American system of government.

I repeat, I am proud, and consider it a compliment, to be the object of criticism and denunciation from the mouths of Communists and other subversive, un-American organizations.

For that reason, and because of the false and fraudulent assumption by Communists of the right to speak for American labor, I now ask unanimous consent to print at this point in the RECORD the text of my remarks to the CIO representatives, and also the text of the advertisement signed by the Communist Committee of Washington County, Pa.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF EDWARD MARTIN, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA, TO A DELEGATION OF REPRESENTATIVES OF PENNSYLVANIA CIO UNIONS IN THE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE ROOM, THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1947

I appreciate very much this opportunity to meet with you representatives of the CIO.

This meeting is so important that I have written out what I want to say.

I cannot tell you in detail how I shall vote on the various provisions of the new labor bills, but I do want you to know where I stand on certain principles because my vote in the Senate will be guided by those principles.

First, these are the things I am for:

Your right to organize.

Your right to bargain collectively.

Your right to strike—because a strike is free speech in action—unless the greater right—the health and safety of the people is endangered.

While, as I have said, I recognize labor's right to strike to obtain relief from grievances, I am opposed to jurisdictional strikes, to sit-down strikes, and secondary boycotts.

I maintain that the obligation to live up to their contracts should rest equally upon labor organizations as it does upon management.

I believe the American workingman should be protected in his right to work freely at the job of his choice.

I believe the union member should have the right of secret ballot, without coercion from any source, when voting in elections or to decide other matters affecting his welfare.

I believe that the success of our whole national economy is dependent upon the friendly cooperation of labor, management, and agriculture. Government must be the impartial friend of each group. It must not favor one above the other. It must not favor one faction in labor, management, or agriculture above the others. If the pendulum swings too far to one side—then the Government must do as it has done many times in the past—step in to restore the balance.

The argument of the CIO to Congress appears to be: "Let the Government keep out. We are satisfied with things as they are." That is because you have special advantages today.

When big business monopolies threatened to push little business into oblivion and disregarded the interest of the public, Congress passed antitrust legislation. Labor cheered for that. It wanted Congress to get into it. When management grabbed every advantage and pushed labor around, Congress stepped in with laws to protect the workingman. Labor had no objection to the Government's intervention at that time. You will remember how labor descended upon Washington to demand votes for those bills just as, today, it comes to Washington in droves to demand votes against any change in the existing law. But today the pendulum has swung too far in the other direction. Some union leaders are pushing the individual workers around, taking advantage of every quirk and twist in the laws that Congress passed to help workers. Some unions are backing business into a corner and jeopardizing its very existence. Congress certainly never intended that.

As CIO representatives you have talked to me frankly and I am talking just as frankly to you.

The Republican candidates last November were elected by overwhelming majorities. In a heavily industrialized State like Pennsylvania, Republican candidates could not have received those great majorities without the vote of hundreds of thousands of our fine workers in organized labor. This was an indication that the rank and file of labor wanted an end to industrial strife and expects this Congress to enact fair and just laws which will bring this about.

I have always opposed racketeers, whether they be in labor organizations, business, or in government. In the 1946 campaign, one of the main issues was racketeering and communism in labor—yes, and I mean the Political Action Committee of the CIO. I want to repeat here to you what I said all over Pennsylvania during the campaign: "Get rid of your Communists and your racketeers. If

you don't, the Government is going to do it for you."

Just how strong the new labor laws will finally be depends upon how well labor cleans up its own houses. The CIO has not made too much progress to date. Some moves by your leaders toward sweeping out the Reds and the racketeers have been almost entirely a gesture—nothing more.

Finally, I believe that there is no more important domestic issue today than the maintenance of industrial peace. I hope that more leaders of labor and business will learn to preach the doctrine of fair play and good will instead of hate and distrust. Organized labor, as a whole, has shown little disposition to meet these issues with fairness and in a spirit of cooperation. But you're not alone in that. Neither has management. On both sides there has been selfishness and ruthless disregard for the common good—the good of that great third party to every dispute—the general public. Each side has wanted everything for itself and nothing for the other fellow.

Since you have failed to get together under existing laws, resulting in great loss to all concerned, I believe it is the responsibility of government, as the impartial friend of labor and management, to step in and referee this thing for the good of all the people.

I want it understood that I am going to vote for new labor legislation. I will not support legislation intended to punish labor—that is not justice. I want laws which will correct the glaring bad spots that have developed under the National Labor Relations Act. I will vote for legislation which I believe will correct these and other abuses and will move the pendulum back toward dead center where the rights of all are protected and industrial peace maintained.

[From the Washington (Pa.) Observer]

SENATOR MARTIN IGNORES WILL OF HOME COUNTY!

Representatives of the AFL and CIO from Pennsylvania visited Senator MARTIN in Washington to find out where he stood on the Taft antilabor bill.

Senator MARTIN refused to commit himself against the bill. Such action ignores the will of the overwhelming majority of his constituents in his home county, which is pro-labor.

What is the issue upon which Senator MARTIN refused to commit himself?

The issue is democracy. The Hartley bill passed by the House of Representatives is not only a blow against labor—it is a blow against all people and the rights guaranteed under the American Constitution.

To scrap the Wagner Act, outlaw the closed shop and take away other rights of labor means—the first steps have been taken toward fascism in America.

The people do have a stand on democracy. They are against all attempts to deny labor its rights. They know that if labor is denied any rights, then soon all others will lose their rights. This is the stand of the American people—it is also the stand of the people of Washington County. They have a right to know where Senator MARTIN stands.

Senator MYERS, also of Pennsylvania, has pledged to carry out the will of the people, to vote against the Taft bill.

Representative MORGAN, from our congressional district, has voted against the Hartley bill—thus truly representing the will of our people.

We citizens of Washington County have a special responsibility, being the home county of Senator MARTIN, to demand that he also reflects the will of the people—to take a stand against the Taft bill.

This is not a Republican, Democratic, or Communist issue. The issue is democracy.

If democracy is to be upheld then the Taft bill must be defeated. All citizens, without regard to their political affiliation should unite in demanding that Senator MARTIN vote against the Taft bill.

Let Senator MARTIN know where you stand!
WASHINGTON COUNTY COMMITTEE,
COMMUNIST PARTY,
GABE KISH, Chairman.

HOOR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to announce that there will be no session of the Senate Wednesday night, but it is the intention to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m., and to continue meeting at 11 o'clock the remainder of the week. All Senators should prepare to comply with that program. Any committees about to schedule hearings should contemplate that the Senate will convene each day for the remainder of the week at 11 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the announcement include Saturday?

Mr. WHERRY. The policy committee has not decided yet as to Saturday, but it will at least include Friday.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, because of the announcement just made by the able Senator from Nebraska, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations may be permitted to meet tomorrow during the session of the Senate, in view of the fact that we have a large number of witnesses scheduled who could not be notified in time of any change in the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

MEETINGS OF SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Immigration and the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency to sit between 2 and 4 o'clock this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit this afternoon while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR UMSTEAD

[Mr. UMSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a radio address on the subject entitled "Federal Aid for Education," delivered by him in Raleigh, N. C., on April 27, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

XCHII—264

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR JOSIAH W. BAILEY

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "The Testament of a Great Public Servant," from the Southern Agriculturist, paying tribute to the late Senator Josiah W. Bailey, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY AT UNVEILING OF HIS PORTRAIT

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address delivered by Hon. John Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, at the unveiling of his portrait and its presentation to the State of Arkansas, at Little Rock, Ark., April 27, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MOSCOW FAILURE—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "The Moscow Failure," from the Chicago Daily News of April 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOLS

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record two editorials by Walter Lippmann from the New York Herald Tribune for April 26 and April 29, 1947, the first entitled "Federal Aid for Schools," the second entitled "More on Federal Aid for Schools," which appear in the Appendix.]

PLIGHT OF THE DP'S—EDITORIAL FROM THE PROVIDENCE JOURNAL

[Mr. McGRATH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Plight of the DP's," from the Providence Journal of February 14, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to recommit Senate bill 1126 to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with instructions. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into last evening, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, at the conclusion of the session yesterday, I was addressing myself to the pending legislation. I had stated the position of the President, in his recommendation to the Congress at the last session relative to labor legislation, and his advocacy of certain measures of that character. I had read from sections of the views of the minority, which confirmed the fact that the three Senators signing the minority report not only supported the program of the President as recommended to Congress, but also were favorable to certain enumerated provisions of the pending legislation. But as I said, Mr. President, many of us could not bring ourselves to support the proposed legislation in its present form, and its defects would be augmented if the pending amendment—

that is, the amendment offered by the Senators from Minnesota and Ohio—were adopted, and if other amendments kindred in character should be adopted by the Senate at a later time. I placed my opposition to this measure squarely upon the public welfare, as well as upon the interest of the working people who are more directly affected.

I had stated that in the hearings former Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, appeared before our committee to testify. I should like to read a few excerpts from the record of Governor Stassen's testimony. On page 559 of the report of the hearings we find the following:

But it also appears to me that there is some danger of going too far in the adoption of new legislation or the amendment of existing statutes and to so weaken labor that the result would be injurious not only to labor but to our free economy as a whole. It is my view specifically that during the 1920's labor was too weak, and that the result was harmful in the end to labor, to agriculture to capital, and to the country as a whole.

Thus it would appear to be very important that there should not only be consideration of each specific measure, but also an over-all evaluation of the sum total effect of legislation upon the position of labor and organizations of labor in the economy, and upon the resulting balance in the relationship between capital and labor.

The corporate device in a structure of private capital concentrates rather large powers in management. If we move in the direction of less governmental regulation and control of capital and of business, which I hope will be our direction in the years ahead, then we must at the same time be guarded lest we increase governmental regulation and control of labor to such an extent that the result would be to strip labor of its fair bargaining position in relationship to private capital and to, in fact, place it at the mercy of capital.

It is also highly desirable and will result in the most healthy economy if labor as a whole feels that the new national labor policy adopted is eminently fair and just and balanced. The real success of our entire free economy depends upon a feeling of fairness and of voluntary participation on the part of each of the elements of the economy. To me this means a maximum of reliance upon the voluntary action of capital and management and labor and its leadership and the very minimum of compulsion or regulation.

I shall now read from pages 572 and 573 of the hearings. I am reading from part I, as I was in the previous quotation. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] in the hearings asked certain questions of Governor Stassen. The Senator, as appears at the bottom of page 572, asked the following question:

Senator BALL. Didn't that occur before the enactment of the Wagner Act, which specifically prohibits any participation by the employer. All the awards so far certainly have been enforced vigorously on the employer to prevent him from discriminating against union members. So that I do not think fear of the employer would play any part in the individual employee's decision as to whether or not he wanted to join a union or remain in a union. So that the closed shop, in view of the protection that the Wagner Act gives to the union, the exclusive bargaining rights which it gives to the union—the closed shop now is much more a device to consolidate the union's power over the individual worker than it is to give the union power versus the employer.

I now read Governor Stassen's reply, as follows:

Mr. STASSEN. I disagree with you. I think it is one of the elements to balance the strength of labor and management. And, of course, it should only be entered into as a free and voluntary contract agreed upon by management and the representatives of the men.

I would thoroughly agree that there has been an unfortunate tendency through the war to impose various forms, in one manner or another, of the maintenance of membership or union shop. But that will adjust itself if we balance up these labor rights now between management and labor and move on a free-contract basis.

Mr. President, it is not only the Senator from Florida and other Senators who disagree with the Senator from Minnesota. Here we find a gentleman of no ill repute in Minnesota, former Governor Harold E. Stassen, who was governor, as I understand, when the Minnesota Legislature enacted labor legislation, which has been commended by many critics, and who has been a farseeing and wise statesman in the field of management-labor relations. Yet it is Governor Stassen who is admonishing the members of his party, and all of us, against disturbing a fair balance between management and labor, against weakening labor. He warns it will weaken the economy as a whole if we do.

Mr. President, I now read further from the testimony of Governor Stassen, on page 575 of part I of the hearings. This time the chairman of the committee, the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] asked the following question of Governor Stassen:

The other question I wanted to ask is this: You made the statement that in 1929 the depression was due to wage rates getting out of line with prices. I never heard that suggestion before, and I wondered if there was any justification for it. I have heard a good many explanations of the 1929 collapse, but that is not one of them, because wages increased steadily in the 1920's and prices stayed level, so I could not quite understand the theory.

Mr. STASSEN. No, Senator; that is one of the factors that caused the 1920 break, as I see it and as some eminent economists have analyzed it. In other words, it is not correct that wages increased steadily during that period along with profits and product. The facts of the matter are that in 1920 corporate profits in this country were four and three-tenths billions. By 1929 they had gone up to seven and six-tenths billions. This is net profit after taxes.

The average hourly factory wages in 1920 were 61 cents; in 1929, 59 cents. The total product—

Then the chairman of the committee interrupted to ask the following question:

The CHAIRMAN. That was prior to the collapse of 1920, when everything went down and prices were approximately the same. The wage rates, after the depression of 1920, steadily rose. They went down there for a while and after that they steadily rose.

Profits have no relation; profits are about 3 or 4 percent of national income. The question is the relationship between wages and prices. The real wage by 1929 was much higher than it was in 1920 and 1921.

Mr. STASSEN. No; it was not.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, yes; it was.

Mr. STASSEN. No. The labor proportion—

There appears to be some disagreement here between the witness and the chairman of the committee.

The labor proportion of the total national product had gone down from 1920 to 1929. In other words, in 1929 gross national product was ninety-nine billions, and still you had labor at only fifty-three billions—total salary and wages. This holding back of consuming power during that boom rise of the late 1920's was one of the factors of the break. You understand, Senator, I did not say that was the sole cause of the 1929 break. There were many causes, but it was one of the causes. In that period—

And I call the attention of Senators to this statement made by Governor Stassen:

In that period labor was excessively weak in its organizations in this country.

Senator MORSE. Governor, would you say that during the 1920's the fact that by 1929 average hourly earnings in the factories of the country were 59½ cents an hour reflects some light on why we had the tremendous installment buying during that period, because of the desire on the part of labor to maintain a high standard of living, but not the purchasing power with which to pay for it?

Mr. STASSEN. Yes; that was one of the factors. The extreme installment buying that came about with the high production but the low hourly wage, and the whole speculation wave in the country.

Many of these things added together to cause the break of 1929. But, I would say, specifically, that in my judgment, and from the statistics that are available, in the 1920's wages lagged behind the increase of productivity of labor.

If you were to give labor its fair credit for the increase in productivity, wages during that period should have gone up more than they did. During the same period, labor organizations decreased very sharply in their strength.

Those are not the words of the Senator from Florida. They are the words of a distinguished former Governor of a great sovereign State, Governor Harold E. Stassen. They are the words of a man who has achieved national recognition in the management-labor field. He has made a constructive contribution in that field. There is a man, Mr. President, speaking his counsel to his country—against what? Against another depression, against a repetition of the 1929 tragedy. Here is a citizen counseling the Congress of his country not to commit the folly which led to the last tragic depression, which nearly disrupted the institutions of democracy in America and brought this Nation nearer to the brink of revolution than has occurred to my knowledge since Shay's rebellion.

Mr. President, that is a solemn warning to the American Congress by an American citizen. He is telling us that, if we do not watch out, there will be a repetition of what the Government of this country did in the early 1920's, and that the same unfortunate result will ensue.

So when we stand on the floor of the Senate and speak against this proposed legislation, against which Governor Stassen also counseled, when we oppose the bill and the Ball-Taft amendment, does that mean that we are trying to defend labor in the perpetration of a wrong? No. Does it mean that we are

against all labor legislation? No. The President is not against all labor legislation. He has made an affirmative recommendation to the Congress. The minority has favored specific provisions in the bill of an affirmative character which we think should be adopted. But the proponents of this measure are not willing to stop at that point; they are not even willing to stop with the committee bill. We already have one amendment pending which would make it more severe, and we are told that there are others yet to come before the Senate for consideration.

What does Governor Stassen tell us was one of the major contributing causes of the 1929 depression? He says it was the lowered purchasing power of the working people, because they did not have the money with which to buy. Sellers in factories and on farms were not able to find adequate markets for their goods except through installment buying, which represented the inability of the purchaser to pay for what he bought unless the payments were extended over a long term. That was a contributing cause to the inflation and thereafter to the depression which inevitably followed.

Why does Governor Stassen say that the purchasing power of the working people—meaning the masses of the people—was diminished? First, he says that labor organizations were weak, and that wages declined in respect to profits and prices. He said that those were the front doorsteps of the depression.

I should like to call attention to what is happening at the present time in our economy. I have examined some data supplied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The Bureau of Labor Statistics took an average week in January 1945. It was discovered that average straight-time hourly earnings during that week were 92 cents an hour. In December of 1946 the straight-time hourly earnings of wages of workers had increased to \$1.10.

If we go a little further we find that in January 1945, the average number of hours worked each week by the workers was 45.4; but in December 1946, the number of hours worked each week by the workers had fallen to 40.9. The number of hours worked each week was nearly 5 hours less than in January 1945.

We find that in January 1945 average weekly earnings were \$47.50. In December 1946 average weekly earnings, in terms of dollars and cents, had fallen to \$46.86, a decline of nearly a dollar a week. But, Mr. President, those wages in dollars and cents must be adjusted to buying power, and we must take into account the increased cost of living which intervened. The cost-of-living index went up from 127.1 in January 1945 to 153.3 in December 1946. When we make the adjustment for the difference in cost of living, on the basis of the increased cost of living in December 1946, as compared with January 1945, we find that in December 1946 the worker was actually receiving about 22 percent less in purchasing power of wages than he had in January 1945. This fact leads me to the conclusion that what is happening

now is what Governor Stassen said contributed to the 1929 depression, namely, falling "real" wages of the workers. I have shown how the workers' wages, in terms of buying power, fell 22 percent from a week in January 1945 to a week in December 1946.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to ask the Senator what class of workers these figures cover.

Mr. PEPPER. These are over-all figures.

Mr. McMAHON. Do they cover all industrial workers?

Mr. PEPPER. All workers in manufacturing industries.

The only other figures I have are for the bituminous-coal-mining industry. In January 1945 the average hourly earnings in the bituminous-coal industry were \$1.20. In December 1946 the number of cents an hour had risen and the average was \$1.49. But the actual wages of the worker, adjusted for increased living cost, had fallen 6 percent from January 1945 to December 1946. So we see that the purchasing power of wages of workers is steadily falling.

Those figures are in terms of their own previous record. Let us take them in relation to other groups in the economy.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to point out that the fact is that real wages of factory workers have increased more than 20 percent since the 1st of January 1940. While the cost-of-living index has gone from 100 to 155, the average hourly rate has increased 80 percent. The average take-home pay has increased 90 percent. The Senator's figures are all taken at the very height of the war, when the workweek was 48 hours instead of 40 hours, as it is today. Real wages have increased since before the war, without, so far as I know, any increase in productivity; and the hourly rate has increased since before the war to a greater extent than the increased cost of living, without any known increase in the rate of productivity. It is not true that there is a steady fall. It is the result of the reduction of hours from 48 to 40.

Mr. PEPPER. What I am showing is that we now have a declining real wage for the workers of America and that the decline is going on not only with respect to the past record of their earnings but with respect to other groups in the economy. That, Mr. President, is the point to which I wish to address myself.

In 1936 the total national income was \$85,000,000,000. In that year salaries and wages were \$40,000,000,000. In 1941 the total national income was \$96,800,000,000. Salaries and wages were \$60,800,000,000. In 1945 the total national income was \$161,000,000,000. Salaries and wages were \$111,000,000,000.

Listen to the next figures, Mr. President. In 1946 the total national income was \$165,000,000,000. Salaries and wages had dropped to \$106,000,000,000—\$5,000,000,000 lower than they were in the pre-

vious year, 1945—while the total national income had increased \$4,000,000,000 from 1945 to 1946.

Let us make a comparison, taking the net profits of corporations. In 1936 the net profits of corporations, after taxes, were three and eight-tenths billion dollars; in 1941, eight and five-tenths billion dollars; in 1945, \$9,000,000,000; in 1946, \$12,900,000,000.

I call attention to the fact that while salaries and wages diminished \$5,000,000,000 in 1945 and 1946, the net profits of corporations increased \$3,000,000,000 in the same period. It is estimated, Mr. President, by the Department of Commerce that corporate profits, after taxes, in 1947 will be \$16,000,000,000, representing an additional \$4,000,000,000 increase from 1946 to 1947.

I shall consider next agricultural proprietors. Agricultural proprietors in 1946 received four and four-tenths billion dollars; in 1941, six and three-tenths billion dollars; in 1945, twelve and five-tenths billion dollars; in 1946, fourteen and nine-tenths billion dollars. In other words, between 1945 and 1946 agricultural proprietors had an increase of two and one-half billion dollars in their share of the national income. I have said in my previous statement that salaries and wages, however, declined \$5,000,000,000 in the same period.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator have any figures indicating how much of those profits were occasioned by the repeal of the excess-profits taxes?

Mr. PEPPER. I have a considerable number of figures on that point, Mr. President, which I propose to offer.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not want to inconvenience the Senator if he is not ready at this time to give them, but I think it would be very interesting to show how much of the profits were occasioned by the repeal of the excess-profits tax.

Mr. PEPPER. I can give the over-all figure. In 1946 \$3,119,000,000 had already been refunded to the corporations of the country under the tax-refund law. I have a list of many of them here, together with the amount which they received.

Mr. McMAHON. That is not the figure I was asking for. The refund of taxes was based upon a provision of the law which was enacted at the beginning of the war, the so-called carry-back, which had considerable merit in it. What I am asking the Senator for is the amount of excess-profits taxes which would have been paid in this fiscal year if at the last session Congress had not repealed the excess-profits provision of the revenue act.

Mr. PEPPER. That is a very interesting figure. I regret that I do not have it available at the moment. But I stated yesterday that corporate profits in 1946 were \$12,000,000,000 as compared with \$9,000,000,000 even in the war years, and undoubtedly when the excess-profits tax were repealed the corporate earnings increased very largely.

I will obtain that figure and put it into the Record.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. The Senator has given at various times figures for salaries and wages joined together, but I wondered whether there was any way of separating the two, because I have noted that the salaries of the higher-paid corporation officials have constantly increased while wages were not increasing to the same extent, or not increasing at all, or even decreasing. So if there is a way of separating the salaries and wages, would not the Senator's figures be more significant?

Mr. PEPPER. They would be, and I thank the Senator for the suggestion. In fact, some corporations increased the salaries of executives and decreased the wages of the workers. I have here a reminder that a little while ago the Bethlehem Steel Corp. granted 6 cents an hour increase to its workers, and the executives of that company bemoaned and lamented the severe strain that this additional wage increase would be upon the company's treasury. Evidently the ones making that statement did not correlate too well with the treasurer or some other officers of the company, because at almost the same time the company made the announcement that the first quarter of 1947 shows the greatest earnings for that corporation for any period in all its history. So at the period of its peak prosperity it was bemoaning and lamenting the fact that it was having to pay a few cents an hour increase to its workers.

Mr. GREEN. That is one phase of my question. The other is, Can the Senator give the figures separately and deal with wages rather than with salaries and wages for that reason?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to have that figure, and I will see if I can obtain it. I think the Senator's suggestion is a very good one. The figures should be segregated.

Let us consider next the profits of the meat-packing plants, for example. In 1944, they were \$46,000,000; in 1945, \$34,000,000; in 1946, \$67,857,000. That shows somewhat the rate of corporate income increase.

Mr. Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General, in testifying before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments estimated excess charges on contracts, due to profiteering and racketeering by business, at \$50,000,000,000 in 1945. Two thousand and thirty-seven cases have been prepared by the Department of Justice, he said, for court action. That is a little of the other side of the picture, and should be called to the attention of those who assert that the only people in this country who profited during the war were the workers.

A moment ago I gave the figures for agricultural proprietors to show that in 1936 their income was \$4,400,000,000; in 1941, \$6,300,000,000; in 1945, \$12,500,000,000; and in 1946, \$14,900,000,000.

The nonagricultural proprietors received in 1936, \$6,500,000,000 in income; in 1941, \$9,600,000,000; in 1945, \$13,100,000,000; and in 1946, \$15,300,000,000.

The workers alone—those of our people who receive salaries and wages—suffered a \$5,000,000,000 diminution in the dollars and cents they received as their share of the national income. That has not been adjusted for price increases. There, again, I say that the very condition which Governor Stassen warned against is recurring in our economy: Namely, the workers of the United States are now receiving a diminishing share of the national income, and they are having their purchasing power impaired, and thereby the economy as a whole is being jeopardized. So those of us who are opposing legislation of the restrictive character of the bill now before the Senate, that will have the result of diminishing the purchasing power of the people of America, are defending the banker and the manufacturer and the merchant and every other segment of our economy, and especially agriculture, as much as we are defending the workers whose wages are directly being cut.

Mr. President, the disposable income of the workers of the United States has also been diminished; but, in addition, high prices have also diminished the savings of the people. In other words, in 1945, savings were \$34,500,000,000. In 1946 they had shrunk to \$15,000,000,000—or less than half. I think it must be admitted that a large part of the reason for that shrinkage in the people's savings was the increased cost of living.

For example, I hold in my hand a clipping from the Philadelphia Bulletin of April 22, 1947, reading as follows:

SAVINGS FALL OFF

Americans are not saving as much money as they put aside during the war. The Department of Commerce gives the figures for 1946 to prove this and it can be taken for granted that the trend has continued during the 4 months of this year. Rising prices which are the chief enemies of saving have been steadily at work since January.

The Department rightly refers to the high rate of saving in the war years as abnormal. Saving during the war was a patriotic duty. In addition there was not the wealth of consumers' goods on which to spend money. One of the appeals made to individual investors in war bonds was to save money in order to be able to buy postwar products.

Some of the money saved by corporations and wealthy individuals during the war and afterward is going into the expansion of industry. In the workings of our system of free enterprise these savings are productive, giving more jobs and good wages for millions of workers.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not a well-recognized fact that during the war everyone was compelled to save? Our civilian production had been cut down, so there were few civilian goods available for purchase. Is it not a necessary result of the resumption of peace that savings will be greatly decreased from what they were during the war period, and will go back to what they were before the war period began? Is not that a necessary result of a return to peacetime production which is available for civilian use?

Mr. PEPPER. Undoubtedly that may be one of the reasons why savings have

diminished. That is recognized in the editorial which I have been reading. But it is primarily the savings of individuals with low incomes that are being impaired by the high prices which they have to pay for things they need to buy.

Mr. President, I conclude reading the statements of the editorial, with which I agree:

Nevertheless the decline in savings can be a warning that the rise in the cost of living will, if continued, cut the purchasing power of consumers on which our mass-production industries depend. Some Americans will not halt their buying when they are living up to the last cent they earn. But more will be cautious in their spending when they find they are not saving anything against a rainy day.

Mr. President, I now read an editorial published in the Savannah News, of Savannah, Ga., for March 20, 1947:

INFLATION AFFECTS LIVING STANDARDS

Continued inflation will cast many marginal-income families on relief once their savings are exhausted, according to an article in the current Public Welfare, monthly journal of the American Public Welfare Association.

Since 1945 the cost-of-living index has increased from 127 to more than 150, with the effect that relief rolls are lengthening throughout the Nation. Even in 1945, before inflation really got started, 3 United States families out of 10 had to live on less than a marginal budget, Public Welfare reports.

This budget, devised by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics to measure minimal living standards, is designed for a family of four, without an automobile or other luxuries, and with no provision for preventive medicine, hospital care, or higher education.

Estimates based on 1946 figures indicate that at least one-third of the families living on submaintenance incomes already are receiving some form of public assistance. More severe effects are expected when more families with "marginal incomes"—below \$2,000—consume their savings.

Savings are being consumed. In 1945, 19 percent of the families in the less-than-\$1,000 income bracket were spending savings to pay living costs, while 21 percent of families in the \$1,000-\$2,000 bracket were doing likewise. Partial data and other signs indicate these percentages increased last year.

Marginal income groups in big cities are hardest hit by inflation, according to statistics from seven metropolitan areas. The fact that larger families are found generally in the lower-income groups further darkens the picture. A recent survey revealed that the income per unit of families without children is more than twice that of families with three or more children. Nearly half of all children are in families of the latter group.

Mr. President, we see what lowered purchasing power and impaired savings mean, not only to those who have to sell, but also to the living standards of half of the children of America. So if one fights for a principle which will give a chance to the children of America to have a decent diet and to have decent living standards, it does not mean that he is trying to favor any particular group in the economy, as against the public welfare. On the contrary, Mr. President, I repeat that the welfare of the working people of America is the welfare of America, because the welfare of all the people of America is directly related to

the welfare of the workers of our Nation; after all, it is the people who are the workers of America.

Mr. President, I wish to read one other article. It appeared in the January 1, 1947, issue of the Evening Sun, of Baltimore, Md., and reads as follows:

UNITED STATES CONSUMER SPENDING UP IN 1946 (By Frank R. Kent, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, January 1.—With the cost of living at the highest point in any year since the First World War, American consumers are spending about 90 percent of their disposable income but have not yet made serious inroads on their savings bonds.

The consumers' net disposable income, after taxes, now is estimated to be about \$150,000,000,000 a year or \$10,000,000,000 more than the estimated income of \$140,000,000,000 during the first half of 1945. At the same time, according to figures of the Federal Reserve System, consumers are saving now at an annual rate of only about \$15,000,000,000 compared with a rate of \$38,000,000,000 annually for the first half of 1945.

RATE OF SAVINGS DECLINES

In other words, although disposable income has increased by \$10,000,000,000, the rate of savings has fallen from about 27 percent in the first half of 1945 to about 10 percent. Federal Reserve spokesmen said this was about the normal prewar rate of saving, but the consumers' disposable income was much smaller then.

Although consumers are spending a much larger proportion of their increased income than last year, statistics do not indicate that they are dipping into savings to any considerable degree. Sales of savings bonds have held up well, according to Treasury reports, and holdings in the E series, which is regarded as the main issue, have declined only 2 percent between January and September of this year. Holdings in E bonds amounted to \$30,900,000,000 in January and had declined to \$30,300,000,000 in September.

KEEPING NEST EGGS

In addition, Federal Reserve figures show no indication that consumers are beginning to put hoarded currency into circulation. The receipts by banks of bills under \$20 in denomination have remained fairly constant. People who have salted away currency against a rainy day usually do so with bills of small denomination, it was explained. There have been no significant increases in the number of such bills entering circulation.

Federal Reserve spokesmen are reluctant to attribute the decline in the rate of savings and the increase in the rate of spending to any single cause. They think three factors have played an important part in the change, but they refuse to place any element above the other two. These factors are:

1. Consumer demand created by war scarcities and increased purchasing power.
2. Higher wages which also increased purchasing power.
3. Removal of controls which permitted prices to rise.

CONCLUSION DRAWN

Actually, spokesmen said, they do not think liquid assets in the form of savings in money and securities have played an important role in the change. The result might have been the same if wages had been increased and there had not been a backlog of liquid assets as well.

Spokesmen said one logical conclusion might be drawn from figures available. The average consumer today is spending more and saving less. He may be doing so voluntarily by buying vacuum cleaners, radios, and other items he has wanted throughout the war-shortage era, or he may be doing so involuntarily in order to meet the rising cost-of-

living index, or it might be a combination of the two. The fact remains that he is spending more at present.

ADVANCE IN LIVING COSTS

That the cost of living is an important factor in the increased spending is borne out by a report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics issued the first part of the week. According to BLS statistics, prices advanced more during 1946 than in any single year since the First World War.

Primary market prices increased 31 percent. Retail prices of family living essentials rose 18 percent from December 1945 to December 1946. Retail food prices rose 34 percent in the same period.

Mr. President, in the past there has been a steady increase in the labor force of this country. In fact, including the armed forces, in 1944 the labor force in the United States reached 64,000,000. Sixty-four million of our people then were gainfully employed. At the present time, including the armed forces, it is estimated that 61,000,000 of our people are gainfully employed. It is pertinent, however, to observe that in agriculture the number of people employed today, although the output is greater, is 1,000,000 less than in 1940. As a matter of fact, in 1940 there were 9,500,000 workers employed in agriculture; in 1944 there were 8,100,000; and in 1946 there were 8,500,000, or 1,000,000 less than in the year 1940.

Mr. President, what is the significance of that fact? It means that if there is unemployment in the cities, the workers can no longer go back to the farms to find employment, because today they are not needed upon the farms. There has been an increase in productivity upon the farms which permits agriculture in America to produce a larger volume with fewer workers by millions than were employed in the year 1940.

Mr. President, it is ominous that today in agriculture and industry we have the highest productivity we have ever had. A large part of it is consumed by demands from abroad. We now have an export market of approximately \$15,000,000,000 a year. But where is most of the money coming from to sustain that export market? It is coming from the United States Treasury, or from private credit extended by American business men, as was the case in the 20's, when a similar market came from the same sources and we helped to build up Germany to fight World War II with American capital, which we never got back.

Mr. President, I say that the best way to have an assured market for the American producer on farm and in factory is for the American people to be able to buy and to use what we make in America. Of course, all of us favor a large foreign trade. We may differ as to the best method of getting it, but we all want a large foreign market for American production. I hope the present market will continue; I even hope it will expand, although we know that, as a practical matter, it is unlikely to occur. We may see American exports stop or be reduced to the amount of the diminution in the American taxpayer's money which we are letting foreigners have with which to buy from abroad. Would it not be better therefore, to depend upon the Ameri-

can market as much as possible? If we have goods to give away, after all, the American people could share in the gift and the donation with the countries whose people are in such low-income groups that, judged by American standards, they cannot have a decent standard of living.

I do not wish to be misunderstood; I am not suggesting that we should not help people abroad in every possible way; but I think we should get other nations to cooperate with us in doing that. I do not think America is rich enough to do it all by herself. I think the Social and Economic Council was set up in the United Nations so that nations might cooperate with one another in achieving such an objective, and I think we should use that agency of the United Nations in trying to work out trade patterns and commercial policies and practices which will make it possible for the economy of the whole world to be improved. I commend the meeting that is in progress in Geneva, where an attempt is being made to work out an international convention which will aid the commerce of all countries.

I should like to see the United States operating through the World Bank. I thought that we should have worked through the World Bank in the past. It has not yet made a dollar loan, in spite of the fact that it has billions of dollars to lend. It was set up for that purpose.

I should like to see the United States using other mechanisms of the United Nations Organization, or mechanisms set up by it which will stimulate the commerce and the purchasing power of the world, so the colossal productivity of America may continue uninterrupted in its unprecedented volume.

Mr. President, I say that if the power of the workers of America to demand decent wages and salaries from their employers is broken down, the purchasing power of the real market of America will be diminished, and the whole American economy will be condemned to another depression. There will be some people suffering again as people suffered through the last depression, and there will be a few of the very rich jumping out of the windows of the skyscrapers again, just as they did in the dark days of 1929.

Mr. President, I wonder why more of them cannot understand that the recipe for American prosperity is very simple. All that is necessary is to make it possible for the great masses of the people of America to buy. Then the factories can run day and night, the farms can run throughout the season and periods of the year, with their marvelous output, and everyone can be well off. But impair the buying power of the American worker, and the factory wheels in every part of America will be stilled, and food from our farms will be rotting again in the elevators and in the warehouses and in the fields, as it did in the last depression, with a nation hungry, but unable to buy.

We are debating here today whether we are going to have another depression, and when we are going to have it. I feel almost like saying of some of the

proponents of legislation of the character that we are considering—and I say it with no irreverence—as the Master prayed upon the cross for His crucifiers, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

The tragedy is that the proponents of such legislation are not only striking at the workers, at whom it seems so many are willing to strike. It is popular today to denounce labor. If a man dares stand up today for the workingman, he is practically accused of putting himself in the category of the criminal, certainly of the racketeer, because some gentlemen who are so loose with their language readily assume that every American labor leader is a racketeer, but every head of a giant corporate enterprise is an angel with golden wings with no taint upon him at all.

Mr. President, I am saying that the advocates of this type of legislation are hurting the manufacturer, they are hurting the farmer, they are hurting the banker, they are hurting the rich and the well-to-do, as well as the poor, in America. I protest against the folly of a course which would hurl this Nation from the peak of prosperity, which it now enjoys, and cast it into the abysmal pit of another pitiful depression. Yet, that is what Governor Stassen said similar policies did after World War I. That is what we say the same policy is doing again after World War II.

Let it be said hereafter, then, Mr. President, who were the ablest and strongest advocates of free economy, of free enterprise, of freedom of action in this great country of ours, and who even stood up better for big business. Let our works be judged by the fruits of our labor in the tragic years to come, if legislation of the kind proposed shall be written upon the statute books of the land.

Mr. President, what is this legislation all about? We have been hearing from certain segments of the press and from certain parts of the people an imperative demand—for what? For legislation to stop these strikes, they say. That is what they want, that is what they are aiming at, something to stop these strikes.

Mr. President, what is a strike? It is when a group of American citizens—I assume they are American citizens; at least most of the workers of America are American citizens—it is when the workers of America, or any part of them, for reasons they deem adequate, leave work collectively to secure increased purchasing power. Has that gotten to be a crime in peacetime, when a Presidential proclamation has announced the end of hostilities? We did not make it a crime during the war, and what phenomenal results were obtained by a voluntary, cooperative spirit between Government and labor. Labor did not let the soldiers and the sailors and the airmen of America down. There were a few strikes, but a smaller percentage than there were in Great Britain, although that country had drastic antilabor legislation on its statute books. By and large, American labor kept its no-strike pledge. Within the same 24-hour period, I was talking

to one of our officers who was in France and to a naval officer who had been in combat in the Pacific. The officer who was in France was sitting with me one evening, talking casually about the war. He said, "It simply thrilled me to see magnificent American equipment rolling across those fields and into the hands of men who were using it to bring us supreme victory." He said, "It was American equipment which, after all, made it possible for us to win the war, even with the loss of life we sustained." In the same 24-hour period, the naval officer who had been in combat in the Pacific, made almost the same remark. He said, "You cannot imagine what magnificent equipment we had out there in the Pacific war."

O Mr. President, we had the finest men God ever made, who were using those machines, but they could not fight a modern war with bare hands. It was what rolled out of the factories of America which, as much as anything else, made this precious victory possible for American arms.

And so, Mr. President, what this legislation aims to accomplish is the prevention of strikes. That is its aim. Would it not be pertinent to know what are the causes of strikes? Why do strikes occur? Why do people quit work?

I have figures here for 1945, but I shall refer now only to figures which have previously been put into the RECORD by the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and here they are: There were 29 major strikes in the first 6 months of 1946, causing a work stoppage that equaled 66,190,000 man-hours. Twenty-one of those 29 strikes were over wages, and they accounted for a total lost working time of 63,500,000 man-hours. In other words, 96 percent of all the time lost due to those 29 major strikes was lost in disputes over wages. Three of the strikes were due to disputes over wages and union security, accounting for 2,500,000 man-hours lost. Two of the strikes were over union recognition, accounting for 120,000 man-hours lost. Three of the strikes, for all other reasons, were responsible for 70,000 man-hours of lost time.

What does that indicate, Mr. President? It indicates that the reason most men quit work is over disagreements with management about wages. Are people to be stopped for quitting work because they do not feel they are getting a fair wage? Are they to be put in jail because they will not work for an employer who, in their opinion, is not paying what they are entitled to receive? If strikes are to be stopped, Mr. President, and if most of the strikes are the result of wage disputes, can strikes be stopped without setting up some procedure to stop or diminish wage disputes? The answer to that question seems to be as simple as anything can be.

For example, a case in point now is the telephone strike. What is the basis of it? Primarily it is a dispute over wages. What is the opinion of the American people about the telephone strike? It should be borne in mind that, if the bill which is now being debated were law, the Attorney General could get an injunction against the strike of the tele-

phone workers, and, if they quit work in violation of the injunction, presumably they could be sent to jail. I shall discuss presently whether such a provision would be constitutional; but presumably they could be sent to jail; at least they could be fined any amount the court saw fit to fine them. Mr. President, how does the American public feel about the telephone strike?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand that under the provision of the pending bill workers striking for such purpose could be sent to jail.

Mr. PEPPER. The bill as now drawn allows the Attorney General, if he chooses to do so, to obtain an injunction in respect to a strike that affects the whole industry, or that, in his opinion, affects the national health or safety.

Mr. TAFT. It must affect both. It must affect the entire industry throughout the country, and also affect the national health or safety.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well.

Mr. TAFT. I doubt very much that the telephone strike comes within its terms. But, apart from that, of course, I think it should be pointed out that the injunction provided for is an injunction for only 60 days. Surely it is not too much to ask workers to continue working for 60 days, while the Government makes an effort to settle the dispute, if it affects the safety or health of 140,000,000 people. Surely, it is merely a slight inconvenience to ask them to wait for 60 days.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it would be far less inconvenient for the courts to have authority to make the company pay an increased wage that would satisfy the workers for 60 days, to avoid an interruption in the public service, it seems to me; yet I know there is hardly a provision in the bill which imposes any effective duty upon the employer not to provoke a work stoppage, by making him pay a decent wage for the work performed by the employees.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, this provision applies to the employer just as much as to the employee. It says that during 60 days, in effect, the status quo shall be maintained. Any settlement is bound to be retroactive. That is no hardship on anybody, when the settlement comes. So I cannot see that the bill would in any way limit any material right of the worker by asking him, rather than to affect the safety or health of millions of people, to go on working for 60 days at the same terms he himself agreed upon a year before, perhaps, when the last contract was made.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator does not see the situation differently, because, in his capacity as the able chairman of this committee, he could have put into the bill probably some provisions that would have imposed the duty on the employers of America to pay a fair wage to workers. It must be the opinion of those who participated in the Gallup poll to which I am going to

refer that the workers in the telephone industry are not getting what they are entitled to receive. Yet we have had announcement after announcement by the Secretary of Labor that he is trying to bring the parties together. If there has been any offer at all on the part of the greatest monopoly in America, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., it has been a very immaterial one, \$2.50 a week, the counter offer of a very small amount.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not recall all the details, but I understand there has been an offer to arbitrate the question of wages, absolutely, finally, and bindingly on the various companies who have certified bargaining agents with whom to deal.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, there may be such an offer on the part of some company, or, perhaps, it applies to the whole industry; but the point is, Why is it that they so stubbornly stand out against giving their workers a decent wage increase? Why does not the telephone company follow the example of some of the other companies which in the last few days have raised the wages of their workers in some cases 15 cents an hour? No, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. today is doing some of the same things that it has done previously. There was an earlier case when the same company was involved, and I am reading now from part 2 of Report No. 1012 by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on (S. 1349), dated March 14, 1946. This is what the report says relating to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938:

The ability of the Bell System—

That is the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.—

The ability of the Bell System to shoulder the required increase in operating expenses is indicated by a glance at the company's history of profit ability. In 1926 dividends declared for the telephone industry stood at \$190,000,000 and by 1944 they had climbed to \$339,000,000. By this date Bell's total assets amounted to six and one-half billion dollars, after the company had maintained for 23 years—

Mind you—

its \$9 dividend payments.

Mr. President, that \$9 dividend was paid by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. even during the years of the depression.

Without interruption during the 5 years ending in 1935, while about one-fifth of the employees of the company were laid off, dividend payments by A. T. & T. increased 45 percent, despite the level dividend. The introduction of the dial system during this period eliminated six manual operators for every dial-switchboard operator retained.

Mr. President, here we see the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.—I believe the greatest monopoly in America—having maintained an unbroken record of a \$9-a-year dividend for 23 years, including the depression years, in spite of the workers being laid off, yet complaining that it was too poor to pay a decent wage to its workers.

Mr. President, I have heard—although I have it only by the word of a man who

said he was on the board, or had some connection with it—that President Hoover called Mr. Walter Gifford to Washington and made him head of a committee the objective of which in the days of the depression was to get people back in jobs and to increase employment, to stop the unemployment that was sweeping over America. Mr. Gifford came here, I was told, secured an office here, hired a number of people, and set up shop to try to find employment for those who had no work. He stayed a while, Mr. President, resigned, went back to New York, and laid off more than 100,000 of his own workers, but he never cut the \$9 company dividend, when, I am told, that by reducing the dividend to \$6 he could have kept every one of those workers at work.

Mr. President, what kind of an attitude toward the public welfare does that manifest on the part of certain segments of management? I am not saying that represents everyone's attitude, or even the attitude of a majority, but I am saying that if the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. continued the \$9 dividend all during the depression their workers had to pay for it by not having jobs, because we know the telephone business was not expanding during those dark years. So there is a management which appears—and its record in this strike tends to bear it out—to think more of its constant record of exceptional dividends as the greatest American monopoly than it does about the living standards and the purchasing power of the men and women who work for it.

That seems to be borne out with singular understanding, Mr. President, in the opinion of the people about the telephone strike. I have before me the Washington Post of today, Tuesday, April 29, and on page 2 there is a Gallup poll. I quote from the article, as follows:

PUBLIC SYMPATHY WITH WORKER IN NATIONAL TELEPHONE STRIKE

PRINCETON, N. J., April 28.—There is a substantial amount of public sympathy on the side of the telephone workers.

A coast-to-coast public-opinion poll conducted by the institute during the period April 11 to 21 shows the following:

1. Twice as many people polled said they are in sympathy with the workers as with the company.

Is it not remarkable, Mr. President, how the people seem to have a way of understanding these things? No wonder Abraham Lincoln said that they were in the long run the safest depository of power. They have a way of sensing and understanding things. It may be that they do not know the amount involved in the payment of dividends of \$9 a share, but somehow or other they seem to understand the situation.

However, a substantial number of voters expressed no opinion.

2. Among people in nontelephone homes sentiment is about 3 to 1 with the workers.

3. Even among those in homes with telephones the weight of sentiment is more on the side of the workers than on the side of the company.

Judging by these indications the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. has a public-relations problem of some seriousness on its hands as a result of the strike.

Maybe the people understand that the company has not made any offers to amount to anything, Mr. President, for the settlement of the strike; that perhaps the company prefers to break it. Maybe it thinks the Congress is going to adopt policies which will give it assistance. I hope not.

There is wide public support for the contention that the issues should be arbitrated and the workers return to their jobs.

The majority of voters believe the Government should require the workers to go back to work while the strike is being settled. That feeling is especially strong among those in homes with telephones.

To measure sentiment the institute used its new "quintimensional" or five-way approach in designing the questions put to the public. The purpose of the quintimensional technique is to probe attitudes by the use of many questions instead of only one.

Then the article goes on to give the answers to the five questions which are put. The point is that the American people are sympathetic with the telephone workers because they feel that they are not receiving a fair wage for the work they do.

In January 1947, the average pay for telephone operators was \$33 a week. At the same time the average weekly pay for workers in manufacturing was \$46.94, nearly \$14 more for the workers engaged in manufacturing than the workers engaged as telephone operators. The average weekly pay check for all telephone employees of the Bell System was \$43.19 in January 1947, and the average of the Western Union employees in the same period—and I see no reason why the bankrupt Western Union should in the nature of the business have a higher wage scale—was \$46.83, or \$3.64 more a week than the telephone weekly wage scale. Yes, a Bell System subsidiary in Cincinnati with 100-percent profit issued a stock dividend of one new share for each six outstanding years while their operators walk the streets. In the electric light and power industry the average weekly wage was \$54 for the worker, and in the rubber goods industry the average weekly wage for the worker was \$54.26. So it seems that the public is right in its feeling that the telephone workers are not getting a fair wage, and that they are entitled to concessions which they are not getting from the company.

I have said that the main cause of strikes is disputes over wages. Is there any procedure established by the proposed legislation to prevent such disputes, or to make the employer more agreeable to a fair wage settlement with employees? Does the bill offer any procedure by which there would be fewer strikes due to unsettled wage disputes? On the contrary, the proposed legislation would impose no duty upon the employer to pay more, to pay a fairer wage, or to meet the employee more nearly half way. All the bill does, in substance, is to establish procedures and provisions the effect of which would be to weaken the strength of the workers' organizations and to impair their ability to stand up against unfair wages. The bill provides means by which workers may be coerced into continuing to work for wages which they do not believe to be fair.

For example, on page 14, line 10, in section 8 (b) the bill has a provision which makes it an unfair-labor practice "to persuade or attempt to persuade an employer to discriminate against an employee with respect to whom membership in such organization has been denied or terminated on some ground other than his failure to tender the duties and initiation fees uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership or because he engaged in activity designed to secure a determination pursuant to section 9 (c) (1) (A) at a time when a question concerning representation may appropriately be raised."

The effect of that provision is that, if a worker is discovered to be for all practical purposes a company spy, if management has put him in the ranks of labor to obtain information to use against labor in bargaining negotiations, or if a man has engaged in a wildcat strike in violation of a union contract and union discipline, or if he has exhibited an antiunion attitude and opposes what the majority of the union feels is the best interest of the union and the union ousts him from membership, that is an unfair-labor practice for which the union may be made the subject of a cease and desist order by the Labor Board, and may be taken to court by the Labor Board, and in other ways may be affected if it persuades or attempts to persuade the employer to discharge the worker.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has referred to three cases. The first was a case in which the man might be an employer's spy. Of course, the very employment of such a spy, the very fact that there was any such representation, would be primarily an unfair-labor practice on the part of the employer, and the employer would be compelled to discharge that man, entirely apart from this provision.

The second case which the Senator suggested was that of a man engaging in a wildcat strike. Surely the employer would be delighted to discharge a man who engaged in a wildcat strike, although the union might insist on his taking the man back.

The third case which the Senator cites is that of a member of a union who displays an antiunion attitude. The union says, "You must get out of the union." The union also goes to the employer and says, "You must fire this man, because he does not like the union." He may have some conscientious objection to being in a union. It is contended that the employer should be obliged to discharge the man because the union does not like him. That is what we are trying to prevent. I do not see why a union should have such power over a man in that situation.

Mr. PEPPER. What we are now debating is a difference of opinion. As Justice Holmes once said, everything from the Twelve Tables to the present time is a matter of degree. I have found that in most things there is a balance of interest. We must balance one side against the

other. By which policy do we do the greater good? My position is that it is necessary for the union to have some discipline if it is to be an effective organization to defend and protect the workers. My reasoning is that if the union, for reasons sufficient to it, goes to the limit of ousting a member, the larger interest and the greater good will in the long run be accomplished if the employer accepts the action of the union—we are talking about a closed shop case—and is governed accordingly. I am disposed to believe that the union will be as fair toward a fellow workman as is the employer.

In the case I have cited, all the employer is doing is asking his workers to get along with one another. Remember that the worker is protected by the union's constitution and bylaws. Remember that the worker is presumed to have had a fair trial by his peers in the union. I presume that there would be a right of redress in the courts if a man, for reasons which were arbitrary and capricious and without some justification in fact and principle, were ousted from membership in a union.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. There have been known cases in which the company has planted members in a union who have taken an active part in the affairs of the union for the very purpose of disrupting it. I know of a case of a detective being employed by a corporation for the very purpose of disrupting the union. He became a member of the union and became exceedingly active in its affairs. He undertook to write a new constitution and bylaws for the union, in which he inserted extreme provisions which made the union look so absurd and ridiculous in the eyes of the people that the public was turned against it. It was subsequently discovered that this man, who had taken such an active part in the organization, was a detective.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Ohio will say, "That is a case of a labor spy on the part of management." In the first place, he must be caught. How long was he a detective or labor spy for the company before he was caught?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Obviously the union did not know it.

Mr. PEPPER. No.

Mr. TAFT. It was quite as difficult for the union as for the employer.

Mr. PEPPER. The employer hired him.

Mr. TAFT. The moment there is any evidence of any such activity, it becomes an unfair labor practice on the part of the employer. The Board has been exceedingly vigilant to see that an unfair labor practice charge was filed against an employer the moment such a case occurred, and that the man was dismissed.

The employer must dismiss him. It is not even necessary for the union to ask it. The employer must dismiss him or subject himself to the penalties of the act. The act has worked in that respect,

and has practically eliminated such cases.

Mr. PEPPER. But the able Senator will admit, will he not, that this bill proposes to change the present law in a contract case? Under the present law if the union ejects a man the employer has got to let him go. This bill changes that practice, does it not?

Mr. TAFT. That is true, but such a man as the Senator is talking about has to be fired by the employer whether he is fired by the union or not. Ejection from the union has nothing to do with it. He is fired because of an unfair labor practice on the part of the employer. It is the law, and it remains the law even if this bill be enacted.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. In the case of a man who is employed by management to assist in disrupting the organization, would it not be proper in any event to ask the discharge of such a member of the union?

Mr. PEPPER. I will ask the Senator from Montana if I am correct in understanding that in the case he puts, the company hired the man and put him into the ranks of labor in order that he might stir up trouble?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; that is exactly the point. In the case to which I have referred, the company brought in a great many spies and detectives. The city was filled with them. They not only became members of the union, but became active in the agitation which developed in connection with the strike. An agent would stand on the street corner and make inflammatory speeches threatening the destruction of the corporation's properties, dynamiting its buildings, and so forth, for the sole purpose of making it appear that the union was going to extremes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am told that today it is a common practice for certain detective agencies and strike-breaking concerns to send out an invitation to business executives inviting them to let such agencies furnish a spy to work on the inside of the labor ranks under the representation that in that way they will keep the employer informed as to what is going on in his mine or his factory. In the first place, as I said a while ago, he must be caught and it must be ascertained why he was put there by the company. As the Senator from Montana said, these men act as if they were the most patriotic men in the union; they want to do more for the workers than does anyone else; they demand more wages and better working conditions; to hear them talk it would be thought that they had on their consciences the weight of the world. A part of their strategy is to make the workers commit themselves to an extreme course so that they get in bad either with management or the public. But what about the case of the man who is rewarded by management for what he does? I guess all of us remember the teacher's pet in school, the little pupil who runs up to the teacher and attempts to get the teacher to put his or her arm around him or her and smile and give some re-

ward or recognition. It would be a very easy thing for management simply to reward with repeated promotions and better pay the worker who will come and whisper out of the side of his mouth what they were talking about last night at the union meeting. If they become convinced that they have a fellow-member who is that kind of a person, and in time, according to their constitution and bylaws, they find him guilty and remove him from the union, I say that in the long run the greatest good will be accomplished by letting the action of the union in that kind of a case, a closed-shop case, be governing upon the employer, which is contrary to the provisions of the pending bill.

I realize that we cannot do exact justice even in the courts of the land. We say we let a guilty man escape every now and then under our system of law rather than to convict an innocent man. I say we cannot do perfect justice even in that case, but I firmly believe that, generally speaking, the union will be fairer to the workers who make it up and who govern it, and that to change the rule as it at present exists will do a disservice to the workers.

I now read from page 12 of the bill, beginning with line 24:

That no employer shall justify any discrimination against an employee for non-membership in a labor organization (A) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that such membership was not available to the employee on the same terms and conditions generally applicable to other members, or (B) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that membership was denied or terminated for reasons other than the failure of the employee to tender the dues and initiation fees uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership, or (C) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that membership was denied or terminated because of activity designed to secure a determination pursuant to section 9 (c) (1) (A), at a time when a question concerning representation may appropriately be raised.

In other words, it is not only made an unfair labor practice on the part of the union to persuade or attempt to persuade an employer to discharge a man except for nonpayment of union dues, it is also made an unfair labor practice on the part of the employer to discharge a man except in cases in the three categories to which I have just referred in reading from lines 24 and 25 on page 12 down through line 14 on page 13 of the bill.

In other words, the employer in those cases is not given discretion. It is made an unfair labor practice if he fires a man except for one of the reasons mentioned in the portion of the bill which I read.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Excuse me for a moment.

In other words, if the employer were to find that, although the man had paid his dues and conformed to certain further union requirements, the union was justified in ejecting him, the employer could not then fire the man, because it would be an unfair labor practice if he were to do so, according to the provisions of the bill from which I have just read.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wish to say that of course many persons believe that the union shop, which is the usual form of closed shop, should be absolutely prohibited. The committee did not feel that it should go that far, but the committee felt that if it permitted a union shop agreement which provided that every man must be a member of the union, then the union must be reasonable, must accept as members all who apply for membership, and must accept them on the same terms as it applies to other members, and must permit them to remain in the union if they are willing to pay their dues. In other words, the position of the committee was this: Either we must have an open shop or we must have an open union. We cannot have both.

One of the cases before the committee that I remember was a case in which a man happened to see a foreman knocked down by a union shop steward. He was called as a witness in the case in court, and he testified that the steward was the aggressor and had knocked down the foreman. The shop steward was convicted. The union immediately proceeded to fire that man from the union, and that compelled the employer to fire him from his job. Because he responded to a subpoena and told the truth, that man was fired, and perhaps in that community he could no longer work at the trade in which he was particularly skilled and trained. That is only an example.

But the only effect of this provision is that there may be a union shop, but if the employees do have a union shop, they cannot compel the employer to fire a man because the union will not admit him.

Let us take the case of unions which prohibit the admission of Negroes to membership. If they prohibit the admission of Negroes to membership, they may continue to do so; but representatives of the union cannot go to the employer and say, "You have got to fire this man because he is not a member of our union."

So, also, if a union fires a man for some reason other than nonpayment of dues, if the employee is willing to pay his dues to the union, then the union cannot compel the employer to fire him because he is no longer a member of the union, through some action of the union in expelling him. That seems to be only common sense and common justice.

There seems to be some argument for abolishing the union shop. Personally, I do not think we ought to go that far, because it is an established custom and practice in many industries and has been for many years. But I do think where it is permitted, the unions should be required to let all employees join the union and continue to be members of the union as long as they continue to pay their union dues.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it strikes me as a little inconsistent for many of our friends to be such champions of free enterprise in certain spheres, and to believe so strongly that the Government must protect people against one another in other spheres. When we talk about

regulating business, those persons take the position that the Government must not interfere, but must let free enterprise work as it will, and must let persons or groups in business have their associations and promulgate their trade practices, and must let them be independent, so they will not fear the withering hand of Government which otherwise might prostrate itself into their private affairs. But those same staunch defenders of private enterprise, when it pertains to business in America and the way it works, including the way it treats minority stockholders, in some cases become the champions of public intervention in the internal affairs of labor organizations.

I believe, as I have said before, that weighing the advantages and the disadvantages, Mr. President, the closed shop has made a great contribution to the welfare of the masses of the people of America. I realize that there is something to be said against it. I realize that a prima facie case can be made with respect to a man's being denied access to particular employment. But I affirm that the thing essentially involved in a closed-shop contract is free collective bargaining, the right of free contract entered into between the employees and the employer. I believe that if we are going to allow freedom of contract, freedom of bargaining, between other units in our economy, we must, in order to be fair, allow the same freedom of action in the case of collective bargaining between employees and employers. Once a contract has been entered into between the employer and the employees, collectively, through their chosen bargaining agents—a contract to the effect that the employer will not employ a man who does not belong to the union—is it necessary in the public interest that we invalidate that kind of a contract? In the long run, I believe that the employer will get better results from the labor force through the closed-shop agreement than he will get without it.

I also say that if business in America had accepted the principle of collective bargaining in good faith and full spirit, in the way it was intended by the National Labor Relations Act, the volume of strikes in America would have shrunk to a negligible quantity and amount.

Again I say that we do not have to intervene, by means of this legislation, into this internal affair of a union and deny it the right to protect itself against a man in the union who betrays the objectives of the union, who violates, perhaps, the constitution of the union or the bylaws of the union, and is convicted by his peers and fellow members of having an antunion and an anti-social attitude toward the workers in that organization.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wish to suggest that, of course, if the union does not want to be subject to that restriction it does not have to request a union-shop contract. There has never been a union-shop contract in the railroad industry. It is not necessary, if the union has the

proper standing and the proper ability to persuade the employees to join it.

So if the unions do not like this particular form of regulation they do not have to ask for a union-shop agreement. In my opinion, either there must be an open shop or there must be an open union—one or the other.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am simply standing for the kind of free and private enterprise in respect to the internal affairs of labor organizations which the able Senator from Ohio generally advocates with respect to the affairs of business in the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The pending measure does not propose any limitation with respect to the internal affairs of unions. They still will be able to fire any members they wish to fire, and they still will be able to try any of their members. All that they will not be able to do, after the enactment of this bill, is this: If they fire a member for some reason other than nonpayment of dues they cannot make his employer discharge him from his job and throw him out of work. That is the only result of the provision under discussion.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; but that means, for all practical purposes, that they do not have a closed shop, because the persons then working for the company will not exclusively be members of the union, as is the case where a union has a closed-shop contract.

Mr. President, I was saying, as Governor Stassen said, that all these provisions tend to weaken the effective power of the union, and thereby to reduce its ability to represent the workers in getting fair wages for the work they do.

My argument is that most of the strikes are due to the unwillingness of the employer to pay the wage the union demands; and that if we weaken the union as the collective-bargaining agent of the worker, we diminish the workers' wage, we encourage the employer to exploitation, we diminish the purchasing power of the working people of America, and we do a disservice to the whole American economy. Therefore, I say that what has been the experience of the past does not justify the proposed course in respect to changing the present policy and practice, which in the case of a closed shop does permit the union to go to the employer and attempt to persuade him and argue with him why a certain worker should be discharged, and permits him, if he agrees with the representations of the union, to discharge that man, whom the union has found to be contrary in his conduct to union rules, regulations and policies.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Florida has referred several times to the statement of Mr. Harold E. Stassen before the committee. I wish to say that I fully agree with it, but I should like to read the basic statement. He said this:

As a general background for specific measures, it appears to me that clearly in recent

years too much power has been concentrated in the leadership of our labor unions and that that power has been abused. New national legislation is desirable and is needed to correct these abuses and to limit excessive powers.

Then comes the section of his statement which the Senator from Florida has read:

But it also appears to me that there is some danger of going too far in the adoption of new legislation or the amendment of existing statutes and to so weaken labor that the result would be injurious not only to labor but to our free economy as a whole. It is my view specifically that during the 1920's labor was too weak, and that the result was harmful in the end to labor, to agriculture, to capital, and to the country as a whole.

I agree 100 percent. I agree that we could go too far. But where I differ with the Senator from Florida is, in my opinion, that the provisions of the pending bill and the amendments proposed do not go too far, do not prevent the establishment of a proper balance. They make changes only in cases in which there is some inequality in bargaining.

As a matter of fact, Governor Stassen in some ways goes further than the committee has gone. He advocates a special Federal provision prohibiting mass picketing. But the committee has not included such a provision in the bill. The committee has left that matter primarily to the States and certainly to the National Labor Relations Board.

Of course, the question of how far to go is a matter of judgment. I can understand how men can differ with respect to that.

But the contention we make is that the pending bill retains, without limitation, the power of collective bargaining, the power of employees to choose their own representatives, the power to deal with their employer as one man; and if they can get a majority, all the other employees have to keep quiet and permit the representatives of the majority to bargain with the employer for all of them. We intend to retain all the benefits of the labor legislation which has been enacted since the twenties, but in the bill we correct injustice after injustice which has developed in the administration of labor laws.

I agree fully that there is certainly nothing in Governor Stassen's statement that is not in full accord with the bill which is now before the Senate. He objected to the prohibition against nationwide strikes. We have not prohibited them. He objected to the prohibition against the closed shop. We have not prohibited it. So far as his views are concerned, it seems to me they are in full accord with the general principles of the pending bill.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure the able Senator from Ohio does not contend that the bill meets the approval of Governor Stassen. I am sure he does not contend that it embodies his affirmative recommendations, and only those. I am saying, Mr. President, that it accomplishes just what the Governor warns against; it so effectively weakens the power of labor to defend itself that it is going to mean the impairment of the

workers' wages, the diminution of the workers' purchasing power, and contribute again to another depression.

Mr. President, I stated that in the first half of 1946, which was a period when there were many strikes in the country, there were 29. Those 29 strikes were responsible for 66,000,000 lost man-hours, but 96 percent of all those strikes were in disputes over wages. Yet, I say that all this bill would do would be to weaken the workers' organization, weaken the workers' bargaining power, weaken the workers' ability to stand up against an unfair wage. There is not one principal provision in the bill which is directed at the employer, to make him yield more than he has been willing to yield in the past of just pay to the workers. I ask, how can anyone claim legislation is fair when it is aimed at one side in a controversy?

I am not willing to admit that the 29 strikes in the first half of 1946, 21 of which were over wage disputes, were all the fault of the workers. I am not willing to admit that the workers demanded too much, that they were unfair in what they sought. Unless one takes that position, Mr. President, unless one means that, he is in favor of tightening the screws upon the worker, and trying to penalize him for the employer's wrong.

I say, Mr. President, that the pending bill does not represent balanced legislation. We have not tried to find the real cause of work stoppage, and tried to place the responsibility upon worker and employer alike, according to their share of fault or responsibility. All we have done is to make it possible to drive down and down and down the worker's wages because he is least able to stand up, as he is at the present time, under the existing law. And all this, Mr. President, at a time when corporate profits are at an all-time high, when prices are at an all-time high, and when monopoly in America is at its all-time peak. Yet this has been the period chosen to weaken the workers, more than they have been weakened since Franklin D. Roosevelt recommended the Wagner Act, and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and others secured its enactment into law.

It seems strange to me that when corporate profits are higher than they have ever been, when monopoly is riding like a master upon the horse's back over the American people, with its privilege exactions, and when today we find prices higher than they have ever been, we pick that period to make the most all-out and vicious attack that has been made in more than a decade against the working men and women of America.

We hear private enterprise spoken of, but I want to refer to another kind of private enterprise, the right of working men and women to enter into free contracts with their employers. I do not want to invalidate those contracts any more than I want to invalidate a contract that may be entered into between any other units of our economy.

I say that, if the proponents of the pending legislation want to stop strikes, if they want to have fewer work stoppages, then they should find some machinery by which we can make both

sides come nearer to the median line of agreement in respect to wage disputes and disputes over hours and working conditions. By and large that is overwhelmingly the principal causes of strikes and work stoppages, and if we do not find a procedure and some technique by which we can resolve that conflict, we are not effectively going to be able to stop strikes, except at the expense of the living standards of the working men and women of America.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator does not contend that all industrial management takes the attitude that this drastic legislation is necessary, does he?

Mr. PEPPER. No; on the contrary.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that a short time ago the American Management Association held a convention in Chicago, where they discussed the problem of labor-management relations. They pointed out that management was fumbling the ball in the present situation. I wish to read an extract taken from the New York Times of April 24, in which I find the following:

In the grand ballroom of a big hotel in Chicago last week various speakers warned a meeting of the American Management Association that the future of the free enterprise system depended upon business and industry improving their human relations with the public—that is, with their workers and their consumers as human beings. Top management was held to be fumbling the ball in this important and difficult field. In the lobbies of the same hotel and in the nearby business offices and streets of Chicago's famous Loop, the nerve center of the great Midwest industrial and agricultural regions which come together there, this reporter found strong support for such a view of the current public relations of the American economic system.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana is absolutely correct; there are many, there are scores, there are hosts, of farsighted American business executives who realize that there must be a better relationship between labor and management, who have met labor halfway, some of them more than halfway, in seeking to bring about better relationships which they feel to be necessary between management and labor.

There are many, there are hosts, there are scores of American businessmen who recognize in the unions and in the closed shop, not only essentials for the protection of labor, but a great advantage to the employer as well. There are hosts of manufacturers in America who would not get rid of the closed shop if it were possible for them to do so, because they have found that it is the most effective way by which they may deal with their workers.

Mr. President, the Senator is correct, therefore, that there are many American businessmen who are opposing the legislation now pending, because they know that the effect of it would be to cause more, not less, labor trouble.

Let me quote the words of Mr. Charles Luckman in his address at the annual

convention of the Newspaper Advertising Executives Association, Chicago, January 14, 1947, an address entitled "Civil War of 1947." I find an appropriate quotation right under the title:

Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace * * *.—Romans 14: 19.

What a magnificent opportunity exists for management to practice the enlightened leadership which a few prominent associations have just recently begun to preach. What a chance for industrial housing programs—built not on the slick paper of some news releases, but on the honest, rough blueprints the architects use. With an unlimited vista ahead, what an opportunity we have to go to bat, each in his own community, for expanded educational appropriations, so that the neighborhood kids can grow up with a true understanding, not only of the rights of citizenship, but also its responsibilities, self-disciplines, and obligations.

Business can no longer afford to regard housing, community planning, and allied programs for health, education, and recreation as devices to thwart the unions or as food for the consuming self-importance of some ruggedly individualistic captain of industry. At best, such an approach to our responsibilities is negative and, therefore, sterile.

Whether we like it or not, we live in an era when democracy in industry is coming of age. This means that we have only two alternatives. Either we can put our shoulders behind the wheel of social progress or we can stand in the way and be ground to the earth as that wheel turns. If management is to become a constructive, enthusiastic force for the kind of living our system of business can bring to the people in it, then we must assume our new tasks cheerfully and with imagination, intelligence, and application.

And, concurrently, we must also shrug off the notion that hasty, punitive legislation is going to solve our problem. Many of the newly proposed laws merely strike at the symptoms of disturbance, thereby failing to eliminate the causes of disturbance. If we amend the Wagner Act and outlaw certain unfair labor practices by unions, does that mean that management and labor are going to cooperate together for the best economic interests of the whole country? Have we, in business, so loved, honored, and obeyed Senator WAGNER's law that we can really expect labor to follow any amended provision in letter and spirit?

We must think in much larger terms, because the simple fact is that no one has ever discovered a way to legislate a point of view. For example, think how easily the words "struggle," "fight," and "battle" fall from the lips of labor leaders. Those are not merely words in their vocabulary. They are symbols of their conception of the nature of their job. Will any law change this viewpoint? Certainly not any carved out by the hand of man!

Thus far I have urged both labor and management to join hands in the acceptance of a broad goal which is bigger than themselves. Now I want to be more specific. For the last 15 years, whenever the public began to protest against the excesses of the national labor situation, it has been fashionable to appoint another committee to study the causes of industrial warfare. Since 1938, various committees of the House and Senate have held over 265 days of labor hearings, and have taken over 23,000 pages of printed testimony about the causes of industrial strife. But the fact remains that we still suffer from this same disease, which none of these endless

investigations has been able to diagnose or cure.

Should we not, therefore, decide what we are interested in? So far, all our studies have focused on the subject of industrial war. But is war really our objective? Of course not. What we actually want to achieve is industrial peace. My specific recommendation is that we study it.

We have in America hundreds on hundreds of case histories of peaceful and successful labor-management relationships. Why are they peaceful? Why are they successful? I suggest we find the answers. I urge that Congress establish a tripartite Commission representing the public, labor, and management. The sole function of the Commission would be to study the causes of industrial peace. The Commission would have an unparalleled opportunity to break with the unproductive tradition of the past and, for the first time in American history, to formulate a positive program for industrial harmony.

We must not permit ourselves now to be divided in civil strife, for as one perceptive analyst has pointed out, if two such great forces as labor and management engage in a struggle for dominance within the highly intricate mechanism of the American economy, neither can win and democracy is bound to lose. Both will go down together in the resulting chaos, or in the regimentation which will arise from public demand to avoid that chaos. Free unions, free management, free enterprise, and a free society will either survive or go under together.

Mutual survival—not separate survival—that must be our common aim. If we keep it steadily before us, we can avoid a fanatical civil war—a war which can never be won by either side.

It would mean more, not fewer, work stoppages. It would mean more, not less, hours lost because of work stoppages in the American economy, Mr. President. That is the reason why farsighted and fair-minded American businessmen are opposed to stringent, drastic, antilabor, antisocial legislation of this character.

The Senator from Ohio said he did not think there would be much harm in the provision to which I adverted. The trouble with the bill is that it is the sum total of all that it does that has caused many responsible, moderate, civic-minded, patriotic labor leaders to say that, for all practical purposes, if it becomes the law of the land, it will break the labor-union movement of America; that has caused that kind of leaders to say it will not only turn the clock of management-labor relations back but will stop it; that it will not only impair but will retrogress the forward movement of the working people of America toward a decent standard of living.

Mr. President, I should like to refer to some other provisions. For example, in section 9 (c) (3), on page 21 of the pending bill, we find a provision which reads:

Employees on strike who are not entitled to reinstatement shall not be eligible to vote unless such strike involves an unfair labor practice on the part of the employer.

In the committee report, on page 25, we find the following comment on the section to which I referred, which is a part of section 9 (c) (3):

When elections are conducted during a strike, situations frequently arise wherein the employer has continued to operate his business with replacement workers—

Which is just another way of saying "strikebreakers"—

if such strike is an economic one—

Which means, if the strike is over wages—

and not caused by unfair labor practices of the employer—

It is no unfair labor practice for the employer not to pay the wage the workers say they are entitled to receive— strikers permanently replaced have no right to reinstatement.

That means, Mr. President, they have no right to get the job back, even if the strike be settled. The report cited *NLRB v. Mackay Radio* (304 U. S. 333):

It appears clear that a striker having no right to reinstatement should not have a voice in the selection of a bargaining representative, and the committee bill so provides.

Mr. President, what does all that mean? This is what it means: There is a disagreement between the workers and management over wages; they cannot settle the dispute; the workers go out on strike, and stay out on strike, we will say, 10 days. Management sends word to them that if they do not come back to work within a week their jobs are gone, they will be replaced by other permanent workers. Management recruits some strikebreakers, gets some other people to take their jobs; they go on the job. Management says, "Now, you are the permanent employees; you are going to keep these jobs from now on, as long as you want them and are satisfactory." Then, Mr. President, under the bill there can be an election called by the Board. Who can vote in the election? Only the strikebreakers, only the fellows that are working. Not a single one of the workers who are out on strike, who have been replaced, can vote at all in the election, and thereby the strikebreakers can determine who will be the bargaining agent of the workers. Now, what does that mean?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I will yield in a moment.

That means, Mr. President, that, at the very time when the bargaining agent, previously chosen, is most needed to continue the negotiations, that bargaining agent can be replaced by strikebreakers, and the old workers will have no right to vote. The old bargaining agent will be ousted. The union can be broken up, and the employer will be rid of the union. If he has any union at all, he will have only a company union. Mr. President, what will be the effect of a power such as that upon the stability of the bargaining agent to stand up against management, to try to get a fair wage for the worker?

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. The Senator, of course, is aware, when he talks about strikebreakers, that he does not mean what is commonly meant by that term, because the Burns Act specifically prohibits the employment of strikebreakers who are brought in to work only until the strike is broken. The only change

made in existing law by the amendment the Senator is discussing is to limit the provision to employees who are on strike, who have been replaced, not by strikebreakers but by employees who have accepted permanent employment. The Supreme Court has held that the employees on strike who have been replaced have no right to reinstatement.

Mr. PEPPER. But they can vote.

Mr. BALL. They can vote under present NLRB practices.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. A ridiculous situation results, similar to what has happened in Hollywood, where, I believe, 52 sign painters or set painters had been replaced, but, unfortunately, by only 50 replacements, and the individuals who were on strike and whose jobs had been filled, and who were not entitled to reinstatement, swung the election and decided the bargaining agent. There was the ridiculous situation of a thousand persons voting for a bargaining agent for only 500 jobs. That does not make sense. All the amendment does is to say that only employees, who under present rules are on strike and entitled to reinstatement, can vote to select the bargaining agent.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to make an observation on the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota, who declared that the so-called Burns anti-strikebreaking law had application to this situation. Practically, I do not think it does have. The Burns Act prohibits the transportation in interstate commerce of strikebreakers, with the intent that they should interfere with peaceful picketing. There has been only one prosecution under that act, and that prosecution failed. It is impossible practically to my way of thinking to prove that the intent with which a man was brought across the State line was that he should interfere with peaceful picketing.

It seems to me that if what the Senator from Florida says is true, the employer can, within State boundaries, say within the State of Minnesota, and without running into any danger of the so-called Burns Anti-Strikebreaking and Transportation Act, recruit all the strikebreakers he wants to come into his plant and take the jobs available there. I merely want to keep the record straight by showing that the Burns Act has no application to this matter.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I am not familiar with the details of the Burns Act or the prosecutions under it. I know that it was passed in order to stop the use of strikebreakers in industry, and interstate commerce. But I may say to the Senator from Connecticut that I sat through lengthy hearings on labor legislation during the past 2 years, and I have yet to hear a single charge—even a charge, let alone anything authenticated—that any employers in the last 5 or 10 years

have used strikebreakers as we understand the term.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I think that probably is so, and I think that the passage of the Burns Act was a healthful thing, even though the prosecution under it failed; which incidentally occurred when I was Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. The prosecution occurred within my own State. The act itself was a healthful thing, even though it failed, because it fairly well stopped that practice. But what I wanted to point out was that I do not think it has any application to the present situation, because, if what the Senator from Florida says is true, there is no occasion for an application of that act to any employer who simply within his own State recruits workers to take the place of the workers who have gone on strike.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Connecticut is absolutely correct. All the Burns Act forbids is the bringing of workers across the State line.

Mr. McMAHON. I may say to the Senator that the act does not prohibit the interstate transportation of workers to take jobs. The act prohibits the interstate transportation of individuals with the intent that they shall interfere with peaceful picketing, a much more limited application.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Connecticut, having been formerly head of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, of course, knows about the Burns Act in detail. As he has already pointed out, the act would not prohibit the bringing in of workers to take the jobs, with the promise that they could keep them, and it would not prevent the employer from rounding up persons in the State, as the Senator said, to take the place of strikers. It would mean that the old union would be broken, the collective-bargaining agent would be repudiated, because the new workers would repudiate the old bargaining agent with which it had never had any connection, and in the very instance of a strike which he might provoke, an employer would have the power utterly to destroy a strong union operating in his plant.

Mr. President, can that have any effect other than to weaken the rights of workers in America, to diminish their share of the national income, and to make those who advocate such a policy contribute, as did those who advocated a similar policy in the twenties, to another depression.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Let us assume that an employer provoked a strike, and then in his own State, so that there would be no danger even of the Burns Act being brought into play, recruited workers to take the place of those who were on strike, and in the process of that recruitment he said, "Now Jones, I want to give you this job, but you will have it on condition that we will set up a little

union of our own here, a sort of a cozy little affair between the workers and myself." Is there anything in the pending bill to stop that kind of procedure?

Mr. PEPPER. On the contrary, Mr. President, I think it is fair to say that the bill not only recognizes but encourages the company union, whereas the company union is forbidden under the practice of the present NLRB. I am sure that the bill permits and authorizes a company union, which the present law does not.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The statement the Senator has just made is completely wrong. All the bill does is to require the NLRB in considering the charges, under section 8 (a) (1) or (2), of company domination or interference with a union, to treat affiliated and nonaffiliated independent unions exactly the same. If the Senator wants to defend the present practice of having one rule for affiliated unions and a completely different rule for independent unions, then he may do so. But do not try to make the statement that the bill encourages company unions. It leaves the provisions of section 8 (a) (1) and (2) exactly as they are now.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not want to quote the effects of the bill or its provisions unfairly. Would it be fair to say that it recognizes and encourages what the Senator from Minnesota calls the independent union?

Mr. BALL. All it does is to give it equal treatment with the affiliated union.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. Mr. President, I call the independent union, as described by the Senator from Minnesota, nothing in the world but a dressed-up company union. Therefore I think it is fair to say that the effect of the bill is not only to recognize but to encourage the company union, because that is what I think many so-called independent unions are.

Mr. BALL. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the National Federation of Telephone Workers, which is engaged in the only current general strike, is an independent union?

Mr. PEPPER. It may be, and perhaps that is the reason it is not getting along better; perhaps that is the reason it is weak. Probably the reason why the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., the greatest monopoly in America, is not making any fair counter offers to the union is because the union is still weak, still in its swaddling clothes.

Mr. President, generally speaking, the unions which have been able to secure the best concessions from management have been the strong unions. For example, a little while ago the automobile workers received a 15-cent an hour increase. Theirs is a strong union. Take the case of the steelworkers who received an increase. Theirs is a strong union. But the weak union, as Governor Stassen said, is unable to stand up for the worker. If the telephone union had been the United Steelworkers Union or the Automobile Workers Union, or some strong union of America, instead of being an independent union which is just getting started, I dare say

the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. might have taken a little more conciliatory attitude toward paying the ladies and men who work for it a fairer wage than it pays.

So, Mr. President, I say it is the sum total of all the various parts of the bill that constitutes its principal vice. The net effect of it and the intention of it is to weaken the labor unions of America, and the inevitable effect of that policy will be to diminish the working wages of America and to contribute to another depression.

Mr. President, I should like to refer to what is called the boycott provision of the bill, and I refer to section 8 (b) (4) which appears on page 14 of the bill, and is mentioned on page 22 of the majority report. That provision is as follows:

It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents—

(4) To engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or a concerted refusal to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities or to perform any services in the course of their employment (A) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person.

Mr. President, that is the so-called boycott provision. In the committee report there is language which seems to indicate that that is the secondary boycott. I should like to call attention, Mr. President, to the fact that it also covers what should be called the primary boycott.

Let us now take two cases. Let us suppose a group of workers working for an employer and that enterprise turns out a profit. Suppose there is a wage dispute between the employees and the employer which they can not amicably adjust. Suppose the workers feel that the attitude of management in that case is so unfair that they will not continue to work for the company. So they go out on strike. Suppose that the employer brings in strikebreakers or brings in others to take the place of those on strike. In the first place suppose the strikers refuse to buy products of that plant. I assume that ordinarily a citizen has a right to spend his money for any lawful purpose. In the second place, suppose that product is being taken by another manufacturer and converted into some other kind of a commodity, and suppose these workers, trying to protect themselves, go to that other plant and boycott it and say that that product is unfair, or suppose they go to the workers of the other plant and say, "This manufacturer is unwilling to pay us a fair wage, and we beg of you not to add to his profit by converting his product, with your labor into something more valuable." That would be forbidden under the provisions which I have just read.

I wish to go back to what I believe to be some good authority on the question of the boycott. I read from the case of *Duplex Co. v. Deering* (254 U. S. 443).

The case was decided in the October 1920 term of the United States Supreme Court. This language is from the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Brandeis, which later became the law. This was a boycott case. I read from page 480:

Defendant's justification is that of self-interest. They have supported the strike at the employer's factory by a strike elsewhere against its product. They have injured the plaintiff, not maliciously, but in self-defense. They contend that the Duplex Co.'s refusal to deal with the machinists' union and to observe its standards threatened the interest not only of such union members as were its factory employees, but even more of all members of the several affiliated unions employed by plaintiff's competitors and by others whose more advanced standards the plaintiff was, in reality, attacking; and that none of the defendants and no person whom they are endeavoring to induce to refrain from working in connection with the setting up of presses made by plaintiff is an outsider, an interloper. In other words, that the contest between the company and the machinists' union involves vitally the interest of every person whose cooperation is sought. May not all with a common interest join in refusing to expend their labor upon articles whose very production constitutes an attack upon their standard of living and the institution which they are convinced supports it?

That was from the great pen, the great head, and the great heart of Mr. Justice Brandeis in the October 1920 term of the Supreme Court. Mr. Justice Brandeis was dissenting at that time. He and Justice Holmes alone entertained those views. They were in the minority. But he adhered to his course, and that principle has now been recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States as the law of the land.

I wish now to read from the case of *Bedford Company v. Stonecutters' Association* (274 U. S. 37). This is from another opinion by Mr. Justice Brandeis on the same subject. I read from page 64:

Members of the Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association could not work anywhere on stone which had been cut at the quarries by "men working in opposition" to it without aiding and abetting the enemy. Observance by each member of the provision of their constitution which forbids such action was essential to his own self-protection. It was demanded of each by loyalty to the organization and to his fellows. If, on the undisputed facts of this case, refusal to work can be enjoined, Congress created by the Sherman law and the Clayton Act an instrument for imposing restraints upon labor which reminds of involuntary servitude. The Sherman law was held in *United States v. United States Steel Corporation* (251 U. S. 417) to permit capitalists to combine in a single corporation 50 percent of the steel industry of the United States dominating the trade through its vast resources. The Sherman law was held in *United States v. United States Machinery Co.* (247 U. S. 32) to permit capitalists to combine in another corporation practically the whole shoe-machinery industry of the country, necessarily giving it a position of dominance over shoe manufacturing in America. It would, indeed, be strange if Congress had by the same act willed to deny to members of a small craft of workmen the right to cooperate in simply refraining from work when that course was the only means of self-protection against a combination of

militant and powerful employers. I cannot believe that Congress did so.

In the cases of the *United States v. Hutcheson* (312 U. S. 219) and *Bakery Drivers' Local v. Wohl* (315 U. S. 769) the right of boycott has been recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States as established and legitimate. It would require a law such as the proposed law to reverse the highest court in the land.

I read from the syllabus in the case of *Bakery Drivers' Local* against Wohl:

Members of a labor union of drivers, engaged in the distribution of baked goods, in an endeavor to induce peddlers to work but 6 days a week and to hire an unemployed union member 1 day a week, peacefully picketed bakeries from which the peddlers obtained their goods, and places of business of the peddlers' customers, carrying placards with the peddlers' names and a true statement of the union's grievances. Held, that a State court injunction against such picketing was an unconstitutional invasion of the right of free speech.

The provision of the bill to which I refer would reverse the Supreme Court of the United States. It would deny to American workmen the right to help one another. It would recognize no effort on their part to help their fellow workers lift the level of their wages and their living conditions to what they believed to be a laborer's hire and a decent standard of American life.

So, Mr. President, let no one be misled. This provision is not limited to the secondary boycott. It is applicable as well to the primary boycott. It forbids the principle of workers helping one another in defense of their standard of living, as Mr. Justice Brandeis has so well pointed out.

I am glad to see the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) has returned to the Chamber. I have been waiting to read to him language which I am sure he has heard before, and as to which, perhaps, he has some explanation to offer. It is from a source which he would not impeach—not only the Chief Justice of the United States but the illustrious father of the able Senator from Ohio. This is what Chief Justice Taft said in the opinion in the case of *American Foundries v. Tri-City Council* (257 U. S. 184). I wish to read from page 209 of Two Hundred and Fifty-seventh United States Reports. I have heard it said, "Like father, like son." In many respects the illustrious Senator has carried on the great tradition of his eminent father. But I wish the Senator had been a little more militant in carrying out what I believe was the fundamental, kindly, sympathetic philosophy of the then Chief Justice of the United States toward labor unions.

If the Senator from Ohio felt as I believe his distinguished father felt when he wrote these words, I do not believe he would be pressed into advocacy of legislation which will have the effect of striking down the very labor unions which his father described in this opinion, from which I now read:

Labor unions are recognized by the Clayton Act as legal when instituted for mutual help and lawfully carrying out their legitimate objects. They have long been thus

recognized by the courts. They were organized out of the necessities of the situation. A single employee was helpless in dealing with an employer. He was dependent ordinarily on his daily wage for the maintenance of himself and family. If the employer refused to pay him the wages that he thought fair, he was, nevertheless, unable to leave the employ and to resist arbitrary and unfair treatment. Union was essential to give laborers opportunity to deal on equality with their employer. They united to exert influence upon him and to leave him in a body in order by this inconvenience to induce him to make better terms with them. They were withholding their labor of economic value to make him pay what they thought it was worth. The right to combine for such a lawful purpose has in many years not been denied by any court. The strike became a lawful instrument in a lawful economic struggle or competition between employer and employees as to the share or division between them of the joint product of labor and capital. To render this combination at all effective, employees must make their combination extend beyond one shop. It is helpful to have as many as may be in the same trade in the same community united, because in the competition between employers they are bound to be affected by the standard of wages of their trade in the neighborhood. Therefore, they may use all lawful propaganda to enlarge their membership, and especially among those whose labor at lower wages will injure their whole guild.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I fully subscribe to every word said there; and there is nothing in the bill which in any way operates against what is there stated.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, let us see. The language to which I just adverted makes it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents to do what? I read from page 14 of the bill:

To engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or a concerted refusal to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities or to perform any services in the course of their employment (A) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person.

The language would forbid one man or one agent of a labor union going to the employees of another employer working on a product put out by a manufacturer who would be unfair to them, in their opinion, and attempting to persuade or to induce those workers not to handle the output of the factory in which there was a disagreement with the workers. I claim that the right of an organization to persuade, if it can, to petition, and to seek the cooperation of fellow workers is the legitimate right of an American citizen; and, Mr. President, they are being denied not only the right to seek the cooperation of other workers in self-defense but, in my opinion, they are being denied their essential civic rights of addressing themselves to their fellow citizens about anything they want to present to them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite understand the case which the Senator has put. This provision makes it unlawful to resort to a secondary boycott to injure the business of a third person who is wholly unconcerned in the disagreement between an employer and his employees. The Senator will find a great many decisions written by my father which hold that under the common law a secondary boycott is unlawful. Subsequently, under the provisions of the Norris-La-Guardia Act, it became impossible to stop a secondary boycott or any other kind of a strike, no matter how unlawful it may have been at common law. All this provision of the bill does is to reverse the effect of the law as to secondary boycotts. It has been set forth that there are good secondary boycotts and bad secondary boycotts. Our committee heard evidence for weeks and never succeeded in having anyone tell us any difference between different kinds of secondary boycotts. So we have so broadened the provision dealing with secondary boycotts as to make them an unfair labor practice.

Mr. PEPPER. In the first place, the language of the section is so broad that, as I said, it applies not only to the so-called typical secondary boycott, but to any kind of a boycott. In the second place, it denies to a worker in the printing business his rights. Here we have a situation in which there are four manufacturers in a certain printing service. A single union had a contract with three of those manufacturers. They were told by those three that if a fourth, a competitor, were not brought into the contract and subjected to the same terms they would have to breach their contract or refuse to enter into another contract. The workers appealed to their fellow-unionists in other part of the country not to work on the product which came out of the plant of the manufacturer who would not treat with the union, and the question was raised as to whether that was a lawful boycott. As I said, that is a typical case where the union not only is seeking to protect itself, but calls upon other workers to cooperate, to refuse to work to increase the value of the product of the employer who deals unfairly with them. That is forbidden, Mr. President, by the section to which I have referred. The Senator will admit that it changes the law from what it is today. That is the purpose of the section. Therefore, it is denying to workers the privilege which they now enjoy of appealing to fellow workers to stand by them in their struggle to hold up and defend the working standards with respect to which they are engaged in a controversy.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Take a case in which the employer is getting along perfectly with his employees. They agree on wages. Wages and working conditions are satisfactory to both sides. Someone else says to those employees, "We want you to strike against your employer because he happens to be handling some product

which we do not like. We do not think it is made under proper conditions." Of course if that sort of thing is encouraged there will be hundreds and thousands of strikes in the United States. There is no reason that I can see why we should make it lawful for persons to incite workers to strike when they are perfectly satisfied with their conditions. If their conditions are not satisfactory, then it is perfectly lawful to encourage them to strike. The Senator says they must be encouraged to strike because their employer happens to be doing business with someone the union does not like or with whom it is having trouble or having a strike. On that basis there can be a chain reaction that will tie up the entire United States in a series of sympathetic strikes, if we choose to call them that.

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President; what I am saying is that it is wrong to deny an American citizen the right to address himself to another American citizen and, in a peaceful and lawful way, attempt to persuade him to do anything he wants to ask him to do. That is forbidden.

Here is a case I have in mind: Let us say that there is a lumber manufacturer in the South who steadily refuses to recognize a union, and his employees try to establish a union and the employer discharges them. Let us say that he is turning out lumber in rough form, and is selling that lumber to a mill where, by means of the machinery and labor used there, the lumber is turned into finished millwork. Because that employer refuses to recognize a fair wage demand on the part of his workers, and because they are out on strike as a result of his attitude, which they think is unfair to them, they go a mile away to that planing mill, which is finishing that lumber, and they say to the workers there, "Our employer has refused to pay us a fair wage, and he refuses to deal with us; he refuses to give us any consideration whatever. He just abruptly has said he is going to fire all of us because he dislikes the attempt we have made. We are asking you not to help that man by processing his product and adding your labor to it and making it more valuable. We are asking you to help us defend the standards of labor in this community and the living level of our families."

Mr. President, in my opinion this provision of the pending measure would make that activity unlawful, even though by peaceful methods or means they tried to persuade those workers to accomplish, with them, that objective.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In the first place, of course the Senator's first assumption is not correct, because under the Wagner Act the workers have the right to organize and to require the employer to bargain with them; and if the employer fails or refuses to do so, his action in that respect is an unfair labor practice.

But passing over that, and assuming that the employer has a contract with the employees, and that the only difference is over wages, let me say that the principal point of the Senator from Florida is similar to that in the case of the New York Electrical Workers' Union, which said, "We will not permit any material made by any other union or by any nonunion workers to come into New York City and be put into any building in New York City." The principle announced by the Senator from Florida would make that stand lawful, as it is lawful today.

Of course we propose to change the law in that respect. All over the United States, teamsters are saying, "We will not handle this lumber, because it is made in a plant where a CIO union is certified." The principle announced by the Senator from Florida would have the Government say to them, "That is perfectly lawful; you can do that if you wish to."

Likewise, under the principle announced by the Senator from Florida, the workers could say that the CIO union is not securing a high enough wage for the workers and is not representing the workers in the way it should represent them, and that therefore they will strike. For instance, all over the United States, carpenters are refusing to handle lumber which is finished in a mill in which CIO workers are employed, or, in other cases, in which American Federation of Labor workers are employed.

The principle announced by the Senator from Florida is the same, namely, that if other workers do not like the way some employer is treating his employees, they can promote strikes in any other plant which happens to be handling the product of the plant whose management the workers do not like.

I do not see how we can distinguish between a plant employing union labor and a plant employing nonunion labor, or between a plant paying good wages and a plant paying poor wages, or between a plant employing CIO labor and a plant employing AFL labor. The members of the committee do not see any way of distinguishing between those cases and preventing the gradual forcing of a AFL or CIO control in various unions, and putting workers out of employment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, as I said a while ago, there is no way to provide for perfect justice. There may have been instances of abuse of this principle on the part of labor unions. But again, I say that, when we balance the various interests, we have no right to deny to American citizens the privilege of petitioning their fellow citizens for cooperation in a common endeavor to raise the living standards of the American workingman and his family.

In the second place, Mr. President, I maintain that a citizen of the United States has a right to the protection of his private enterprise, which is his labor. He has a right to work for any man or not to work for any man, so I thought. As I said a while ago, I am surprised that so many of my friends and colleagues are so ready to defend a man's free use of his money, and yet are re-

luctant to assure a man the free use of his labor.

I say that the Congress has not been presented with any bill which provides that an employer cannot capriciously stop buying from another manufacturer because he does not like that manufacturer's labor policies, because they are too friendly to labor. I do not know of anything which prevents an employer who buys a given commodity from saying, "I will not buy that man's goods because he has recognized the closed shop, and I do not like the closed shop, and I simply will stop buying from him, even if it means that his only market is thus taken away from him." But, Mr. President, that is the kind of private enterprise which so many Senators seem to be determined to preserve.

But there is another kind of private enterprise which I should like to preserve. First, it is the right of an American citizen to speak his mind to his neighbor, to ask him to help him in a common humane enterprise. The other kind of private enterprise which I think should be promoted and protected is the right of a man to be free and to be his own master in the use of his own mind.

Yet, Mr. President, here we are confronted with a measure which would deny what the late Mr. Justice Brandeis called, in this case, the right of self-defense to the working people of America.

The President, in his state of the Union message to the Congress, in discussing the subject of labor legislation, took a position quite contrary to that which has been taken by the able Senator from Ohio. Here is what the President said:

Not all secondary boycotts are unjustified. We must judge them on the basis of their objectives. For example, boycotts intended to protect wage rates and working conditions should be distinguished from those in furtherance of jurisdictional disputes. The structure of industry sometimes requires unions, as a matter of self-preservation, to extend the conflict beyond a particular employer. There should be no blanket prohibition against boycotts. The appropriate goal is legislation which prohibits secondary boycotts in pursuance of unjustifiable objectives, but does not impair the union's right to preserve its own existence and the gains made in genuine collective bargaining.

That is the standard to which the minority of the committee adheres, Mr. President. We have said that we supported the President in outlawing the secondary boycott in aid of jurisdictional strikes, and we say so again. But the committee did not limit its action to that. The committee bill outlaws all kinds of so-called secondary boycotts, even when, the objective of the boycott is to preserve wage and working condition gains already achieved by collective bargaining, even if the objective be to solicit in a peaceful way the cooperation of other workers in defending the wage and working standards of a particular community of industry.

So the provision now under discussion is simply another one of the provisions of the bill the effect of which will be to weaken further the movement of the or-

ganized working people of the United States.

Mr. President, several cases have been referred to by the Senator from Ohio, but have there been enough of them, have they become serious enough to justify the denial of all working men of the right of petition to their fellow workers for help? Has the damage been severe enough to justify a proposal to make it impossible for workers to work together for self defense? I do not think so, and I say again that this effort to weaken the unions in working together is made at a time when profits, prices, and monopoly are at an all-time peak.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to refer to pages 14 and 15 of the bill, and to page 27 of the report of the committee. The committee had before it the President's recommendation when it reported the bill, it knew the President had limited his suggestion for the outlawing of secondary boycotts to boycotts in aid of the jurisdictional strike, of which none of us approve. But it deliberately was not satisfied with the moderation and with the limitation of that principle in the President's recommendation; it chose to go further and to outlaw all secondary boycotts, no matter how legitimate the objective of the boycott was. So again I say that many of us, and certainly I speak for myself, are not opposing all legislation, we are not approving all secondary boycotts, but we say, as the President said, that a distinction should have been made, and the distinction should have been predicated on what the objective of the boycott is. That distinction the able committee has ignored.

Not only is the right of petition to fellow workers for cooperation in common defense made an unfair labor practice, but there is given the power of an injunction against such a boycott. On pages 14 and 15 of the bill the grounds which are the subject of the injunction are stated. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will correct me if I am in error in anything I say about this. I should like to draw attention to page 33 of the bill, section 10 (1).

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I suggest to the Senator from Florida that that is not the language of the Senator from Minnesota, but an amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator for the information. It may be, however, that the Senator from Oregon in the final analysis may avail himself of the privilege which I think every man should have, that is, the right of repentance. If the Senator from Oregon should find it appropriate to repent, I hope he will be able to share his baptism with the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon only hopes eventually to be able to persuade the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. My faith believes in deathbed repentance, and I am still hoping to see some of it around here—the repentance, not the deathbed. [Laughter.]

I now turn to page 33 of the bill, subdivision (1) of section 10, which reads:

(1) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice within the meaning of paragraph 4 (A), (B), and (C) of section 8 (b), the preliminary investigation of such charge shall be made forthwith and given priority over all other cases except cases of like character in the office where it is filed or to which it is referred. If, after such investigation, the officer or regional attorney to whom the matter may be referred has reasonable cause to believe such charge is true and that a complaint should issue, he shall, on behalf of the Board, petition any district court of the United States (including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia) within any district where the unfair labor practice in question has occurred, is alleged to have occurred, or wherein such person resides or transacts business, for appropriate injunctive relief pending the final adjudication of the Board with respect to such matter. Upon the filing of any such petition the district court shall have jurisdiction to grant such injunctive relief or temporary restraining order as it deems just and proper, notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided further*, That no temporary restraining order shall be issued without notice unless a petition alleges that substantial and irreparable injury to the charging party will be unavoidable and such temporary restraining order shall be effective for no longer than 5 days and will become void at the expiration of such period. Upon filing of any such petition the courts shall cause notice thereof to be served upon any person involved in the charge and such person, including the charging party, shall be given an opportunity to appear by counsel and present any relevant testimony.

Mr. President, under that all that is necessary is the filing of a charge of one of these boycotts, or one of these so-called unfair labor practices, and then the regional officer or the regional attorney of the National Labor Relations Board must seek "appropriate injunctive relief," because the bill says:

If, after such investigation, the officer or regional attorney to whom the matter may be referred has a reasonable cause to believe such charge is true and that a complaint should issue, he shall, on behalf of the Board, petition * * * for appropriate injunctive relief.

Mr. President, that means that it is mandatory upon a regional attorney, or an officer in a region representing the Board to seek an injunction in the courts, even if nothing has happened except that a complaint has been filed of such an alleged unfair labor practice, namely, this boycott. That preliminary injunction can be issued without notice to the opposite party, and after 5 days, of course, the injunction may be made to extend for a longer time, as a matter of fact, until the matter has been disposed of by the Board, which may mean an unlimited period of time.

So not only are all boycotts eliminated without any distinction such as the President suggested but there is added the arbitrary and mandatory requirement that a regional attorney, upon nothing more than what he believes may be reasonable cause, shall seek an injunction in the courts.

An employer who commits an unfair labor practice is not enjoined. There is no preliminary injunction in the court

provided with respect to him. That is simply another evidence of the regrettable fact that the bill is aimed at the worker, not the employer, and ignores completely the abuses which have been committed by the employers in the past, and attempts to restrict its remedial provisions exclusively against employees.

Mr. President, a case has been decided in my State of Florida, to which I wish to call attention, with respect to another aspect of this matter, that is, the right of the Attorney General to seek an injunction, against a strike and be able to prevent the strike from occurring for a period of 80 days under certain conditions. On page 48 of the bill those conditions appear:

Whenever, in the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States, a threatened or actual strike or lock-out affecting substantially an entire industry engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations or engaged in the production of goods for commerce will, if permitted to occur or to continue, imperil the national health or safety, he may appoint a board of inquiry to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute and to make a written report to him within such time as he shall prescribe.

Then it goes on to say that the Attorney General, upon receiving a report from a board of inquiry, may seek an injunction, in the name of the United States, from any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties, to enjoin such strike or lock-out if he finds that it "(1) affects substantially an entire industry engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce; and (2) if permitted to occur or to continue, will imperil the national health or safety, it shall have jurisdiction to enjoin any such strike or lock-out, or the continuing thereof, and to make such other orders as may be appropriate."

Mr. President, I realize a serious question is presented when a strike is threatened which would vitally affect the whole Nation, or any large segment of it. Like many other situations affecting private enterprise, it may have many ramifications and reverberations. But, Mr. President, those things are accepted as a part of the price we pay for our free, private-enterprise system. There are many freedoms which are abused—freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and other privileges which we enjoy as free Americans—because they are sometimes abused, but we do not find it necessary to take away those rights. We try to curb abuses, but we preserve the inherent right of free enterprise in America. That is what has made us as great as we are.

But this bill does not propose to set up a national arbitration board; it does not propose something in the nature of the Tennessee Valley Authority, as suggested by a distinguished citizen of my State, former Governor James M. Cox, of Ohio, who, out of his great experience, recommends the establishment of something like the Tennessee Valley Author-

ity to act as a governing authority for great enterprises of national scope and importance, with power to fix wages, probably to fix profits, in industries of national importance and significance.

It may well be, Mr. President, that we are going in that direction. It is an outrage for the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. to enjoy the greatest monopoly in America, to be the greatest monopolist in America, but refuse to pay a fair wage to its workers; yet, if the Government does not make it pay a fair wage, what can the workers do except strike? If the workers can be effectively strangled in their struggle for a fair measure of the profits of the business, Mr. President, an injustice has been perpetrated on worthy Americans.

Today there is in progress a nationwide strike. The Government has no power to make the parties sit down together to reach an accord; it has no power to make the employer meet the workers half way. But this bill makes no proposal of that sort, either. It does not authorize the Government to put any pressure upon the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. to make it pay a fair wage to the workers.

I suspect that this bill would be applicable to such a situation. I am sure it would be applicable to the railroads, to the transportation systems. It says "transmission systems," and I do not know of anything more important in the transmission system than the telephone system of America.

If this bill were applicable today, the Attorney General could have gotten an injunction prohibiting the union from striking, and ordering them to continue work for at least 80 days at wages they had already found unbearable. But the Attorney General would not have had a bit of authority to say to the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., "You are not paying enough, you are not paying what you can fairly afford, and we are going to require you to do it." No, there is no proposal in the bill that the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. do anything. There are no rights committed to the Government against the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. In the pending telephone strike, the only injunction that could be obtained, if this bill were law, would be one against the workers themselves.

I maintain, Mr. President, that is not equal justice, legal or social, that is not fair, that is not approaching the matter with a desire to see justice done all around. All it accomplishes is to do what I said was feared by Governor Stassen, namely, to weaken the workers so that they will give up the strike, and so that the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. can continue its unbroken record of 23 years, of paying a \$9 dividend on every share of stock, every year.

Mr. President, that is what I am complaining about. This bill is not fair. The only burdens it imposes are upon the workers. The only party to a dispute it endeavors to weaken is the union of the workers. I say, Mr. President, when, in the first half of 1946, 21 of the 29 major labor disputes were over wages, and when the bill does not do anything to make the

employer pay fair wages, that it has not fairly endeavored to find a basis for the settlement of the kind of dispute that brings about work stoppages in American industry.

Mr. President, it is a matter of enjoining people, from what? From quitting work? I should like to read to the Senate a decision by the supreme court of my State on this subject, which I commend to my colleagues. I will read from page 121 of seventh Southern, chapter 117, a decision by the Florida Supreme Court, dated March 27, 1942:

We are not advised of any rule of law under which any man in this country will be forced to serve with his labor any other man whom he does not wish to serve.

Is not that good Americanism, Mr. President? I am not saying, "to work for the Government"; I am saying, "for any other man or any other company."

Section 19 of the declaration of rights of our constitution provides:

"Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party has been duly convicted, shall ever be allowed in this State."

If the injunctive order be construed to mean that the officers and members of the Longshoremen Association, Local No. 1416, were thereby required to load or unload the trucks of Collins, although there was no contractual relation between the local and Collins, then such construction would violate the constitutional provision above referred to. We think it will not be contended that any member of the local could be committed to jail for refusing to load or unload the Collins trucks. That service required the performance of manual labor and it is beyond the power of courts to punish one by imprisonment for failure to engage in involuntary servitude.

What is it after all, Mr. President, but involuntary servitude if we deny to the workers of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. the right to stop work, if they do not feel that they are receiving the wages they deserve?

Mr. President, if the bill were to set up a board like the Tennessee Valley Authority, to fix wages and working conditions and profits for the transmission lines of this country, such a proposal would be entitled to serious consideration. I am not sure that I would oppose such legislation, because I think the suggestion made by Governor Cox, three times Governor of the State of the great Senator from Ohio, an eminent publisher in America today, that the time is coming when we have got to set up a board which will have authority to see to it that justice is done to each side in disputes of this character, has great merit. There may come a time when we shall have to take over in the public name great Nation-wide essential public utilities. I do not know if that time will come. I know many other countries have found it necessary to do so. We may sometime find it necessary to do so in the public interest here in America.

It is one thing—and that is what was done recently—to deny a labor leader the right to proclaim the alleged breach of a contract. It is another thing to put a worker in jail because he stops work when he feels he has a will and a right to do so.

Mr. President, I do not know of any cases—there may be some—in which the United States Supreme Court, as presently constituted, has upheld the right of any court to put a man in jail because he refused to work for another man or a corporation, because he was dissatisfied with the wages his employer was willing to pay. I say, Mr. President, I do not know of a case in which the present Supreme Court has upheld such action on the part of any court. I am not talking about a fine. I am not talking about enjoining a declaration. I am talking about putting a man in jail because he stops working for a man for whom he does not want to work. I thought that was a basic American right and privilege. Yet the bill requires nothing more than that the Attorney General should say, without any court review, "This affects a big industry. I believe it to affect the health and security of the country, and, therefore, I am going to apply to the courts for an injunction which will be effective for 80 days." That provision will be used for the purpose of breaking the union or breaking the strike.

Again I point out that it does not require that the employer, during the 80 days, shall do anything. In the coal case the court acted under an act of Congress passed during the war and expiring on the 30th of June, and, Mr. President, in that case the Government had the right to fix wages and working conditions, and it did, including the granting of a welfare fund which had never previously been accorded by the employer. But there is no authority under the bill for the Government to fix the wages or working conditions. There is no authority in it for the public agency to compel the employer to do anything that would be justice to the employee. It is all, as I said, on the side of the employer and against the employee, the net effect of which is to strike down the labor-union movement of America and to contribute toward another depression, because the workers would be unable to buy what they otherwise would be able to purchase in the American economy.

Mr. President, this matter of the injunction as a means of settling labor disputes is a very serious one. The first United States Supreme Court case on the subject was *In Re Debs* (158 U. S. 564). That was the case in which the United States Government enjoined Debs and others engaged in the Pullman strike, during the Cleveland administration.

I read from Frankfurter and Greene in their work, *Congressional Power Over the Labor Injunction—Thirty-first Columbia Law Review*, chapter 385, page 412—as follows:

As for the Debs case, what dispassionate student of American society really believes that that case, in its sequelae, has made for peace in industry or enhanced confidence in the legal order?

We find a present justice of the United States Supreme Court who said, in commenting on the Debs case:

As for the Debs case, what dispassionate student of American society really believes that that case, in its sequelae, has made for peace in industry or enhanced confidence in the legal order?

Mr. President, the Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed in order to prevent settlement of labor disputes by injunction. I have in my hand a little statement of how the situation produced the Norris-LaGuardia Act. I read:

The Norris-LaGuardia Act "is the culmination of a bitter political, social, and economic controversy extending over half a century." (*Milk Wagon Drivers' Union v. Lake Valley Farm Products*, supra.) That controversy, epitomized by the slogan "Government by injunction," was initiated by the injunction obtained by the Attorney General of the United States in the Pullman strike of 1894. The public reaction to that injunction was intense and immediate. The storms of protest, in which many thoughtful lawyers joined, were primarily addressed to the perversion of an equitable remedy in a manner that endangered the personal liberty of wage earners.

The clamor for reform quickly assumed significant political proportions. In 1896, 2 years after the Debs injunction was obtained and 1 year after the Supreme Court affirmed it, the Democratic Party denounced labor injunctions as a "highly dangerous form of oppression." Beginning with 1908, the Republican Party, too, advocated the elimination of the abuses inherent in labor injunctions.

Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Taft, in formal, official statements, strongly criticized the labor injunction and urged reforms upon Congress. A veritable flood of legislative proposals was introduced and discussed in Congress. These legislative proposals occupied the attention of Congress during every session but one in the 20 years between 1894 and 1914.

At long last, in 1914, Congress enacted the Clayton Act which was described by President Wilson as "a veritable emancipation" of the workmen of America, and was hailed by Samuel Gompers as "the industrial Magna Carta upon which the working people will rear their construction of industrial freedom." But the hopes thus engendered proved wholly illusory. They were completely frustrated by the interpretation placed by the courts on the Clayton Act.

Inevitably, the failure of the Clayton Act to accomplish its plain purposes renewed, with even greater force, the agitation against equity intervention in labor disputes. Beginning with the Sixty-sixth Congress, numerous bills seeking to offset the crippling effects of the decisions of the Supreme Court were introduced. These eventuated in the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932. Seldom, if ever, has any legislation been the subject of such extensive hearings, study, and debate. The result has been a statute virtually without parallel in the skill with which it was drafted, in the clarity of the policy which it embodies and in the manner in which it has fulfilled its objectives.

It is 14 years since the Norris-LaGuardia Act was enacted. To some, with memories that are all too short, "government by injunction" has become merely an historical phrase, with academic significance only. They are woefully wrong. It would, we earnestly submit, be a grievous mistake to restore the injunction as a weapon in American industrial conflicts. It does not work. It neither mines coal, nor moves trains, nor makes clothing. As an adjuster of industrial conflict the injunction has been an utter failure. It has been used as a short cut—but it has not cut anything, except to cut off labor from confidence in the rule of law and of the courts as its impartial organs. No disinterested student of American industry, or of American law, can have the slightest doubt that, beginning with the Debs case, the use of labor injunctions has predominantly been a cumulative influence for discord in our national life.

That statement comes from Mr. Joseph A. Padway, general counsel of the American Federation of Labor.

So I say that the proposed legislation is aimed at striking down every protection in the law of today, whether it be in the National Labor Relations Act or in the Norris-LaGuardia Act, or in other aspects of our law, under which the American labor movement has grown to its present strength and the present standard of living has been achieved in the home of the American workman, which has contributed, as perhaps no other influence has contributed, to the greatest level of peacetime prosperity America has ever enjoyed.

Mr. President, I contend that this is of a pattern too prevalent nowadays, when the sympathy is all on the side of the strong, and the oppression directed altogether at the weak. This is part of a pattern which we see too often in Congress today, when we are trying to protect the man who is making more than he has ever made, and to drive down the wages of the American workingman, who is already beginning to make less than he has been making in the past. The proposed legislation is not only one-sided but designedly one-sided. It has ignored the recommendations of the President for a moderate law on this subject. It tends to make the monopoly stronger, and while affording no Government protection to the weak would deny the weak the safeguards which they presently have for their protection.

I say that those who are aiding in this effort are not only doing a disservice to the American workingman and to his wife and children, but they are contributing to another depression which will rob us all—the rich as well as the poor, the farmer as well as the worker and the manufacturer. I say that the advocates of the proposed legislation have shown an utter failure to appreciate and reward the patriotic record which was made during the war by the workingmen as well as the fighting men of America—and I include women, because they, too, contributed immeasurably in the conflict, both at home and abroad.

We are going back to the days before the National Labor Relations Act. We are stripping from the statutes of this country the whole body of remedial legislation which has been achieved in more than a decade of social progress under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The effect of the proposed legislation would be utterly to weaken and strangle the union movement, which had made such great progress under the laws and the decisions of the courts.

I believe this to be a great mistake. I believe that we should have proceeded as the President suggested, with legislation limited in character, designed and intended to achieve industrial peace instead of promote industrial discord, to diminish work stoppage instead of increase the number of strikes. I venture to predict that the proposed legislation, if it ever becomes law, will set in motion the most violent management-labor strife that we have ever seen in America, and that there will be more work stoppage than there has ever been in the

past. The American economy, in the prosperity we now have, will receive a blow which will hurl us again down to the tragic days of the early 1930's. It is my sincere hope that we may turn our attention to a more evenly balanced program for the adjustment of labor disputes than this measure offers.

At a later time, before this debate is concluded, I propose to address myself to the monopoly aspects of our present economy, to show the concentration of power in the hands of a few, to show the abuses that have been committed by those few, and to show that a thousand times more tribute has been exacted from the American people by the vices of monopoly than has ever been taken under the tyranny of labor leaders or labor organizations. If we really wanted to protect the American people, we would follow the President's recommendation and make our sword a two-edged sword, curbing the abuses of the employer, the monopolist, and the profiteer, instead of wreaking our vengeance only upon the American workingman, whose glorious history is that he has cut out a great country from an abysmal wilderness and made it today the richest and most powerful Nation in all the world.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MORSE. No; I do not care to have a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon to recommit Senate bill 1126 to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with instructions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to direct a few remarks to the pending motion. I thank the Senator from Utah for his courteous suggestion; but the hour is late. My colleagues can read my remarks in the RECORD. I am sure that we shall not reach a vote on the motion tonight. In fact, before I finish my remarks I shall suggest an agreement to vote. The agreement will involve an hour as of tomorrow.

Mr. President, I have been trying to work out a procedure which would fairly answer the main argument—at least, as I have heard it—against the proposal to break the omnibus bill up into four separate bills.

As I understand the chief argument against my proposal, it runs something like this: We are confronted with a practical parliamentary situation, say the proponents of the argument. The House has passed an omnibus bill. That is an accomplished fact. That bill has been sent to the Senate, and it is on our calendar. That being the case, we must go into conference on the basis of a bill already passed by the House, known as the Hartley bill.

There is reason to that argument. I understand the practicalities of that situation. But, as I have said before both here and in conference with my Republican colleagues, if it would have been better in the first instance to have

passed separate legislation on the basis of individual issues, then we should not change our course simply because the House has followed a course which may prove to be a very unfortunate one. It seems to me that those who agree with me that in the first instance we should have followed the course of action which I am now suggesting should try to work out with me a procedure which will give to the House another opportunity, after the reflection which I think has been taking place in the minds of a great many Members of the House on the action they have already taken, to pass in separate bills on the individual issues which are to be ultimately considered by the conference committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it might be well to call the Senator's attention to the fact, with which he, of course, is familiar, that the rules of the House are entirely different from those of the Senate. Following the action of the Rules Committee of the House, Members of the House could vote on only one question, namely, whether they were for the bill or against it. Only one could be made, and that was a motion to recommit, which was, I think, defeated. In other words, what the Senator is attempting to do the Members of the House had no opportunity to do. They had no opportunity to express their viewpoint one way or the other on any of the measures which the Senator seeks to have the committee report so the Senate can vote on them separately. In my judgment, considering the procedure following by the House, it cannot properly be said that because the House passed an omnibus labor bill, the Senate should do the same thing. In other words, the rule which was reported from the Rules Committee of the House denied Members the right of doing anything other than voting the Hartley bill up or down.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the situation just as the Senator explains it, and I fully concur in his observations, particularly the point he makes that it does not follow that because the House has passed an omnibus bill the Senate should do likewise. Rather, I think it is very important that in the Senate a record be made showing that we do not favor the passage of an omnibus bill, because I believe that is the view of the majority. When I say that is the view of the majority of the Members of the Senate I do not mean that there will be a majority vote to accomplish that end, because some of my colleagues, in fact, quite a number of them—and they have told me so in the cloakrooms and elsewhere—believe that if it were a matter ab initio they would favor the point of view which I am proposing; but they say, "What can we do? The House has passed this bill. We will have to go into a conference on the House bill. We are faced with that parliamentary situation, and although we should like to go along with your point of view as to separate bills, we think we have no other course but to pass a single omnibus bill."

I have been trying to work out some reasonable procedure which will permit our making a clear record of the separate bill approach, because I am still of the opinion that it is our only hope in the Eightieth Congress of getting any labor legislation passed and at the same time giving to the House another opportunity to vote on this issue by way of a separate bill approach. So in consultation with the Parliamentarian and some of my colleagues in the Senate I have worked out the following motion which I now ask to have substituted for the motion which I made yesterday afternoon. I shall read it and then explain it. It is as follows:

I move that the pending bill S. 1126 be recommittees to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with instructions to report in lieu thereof, on or before Friday, May 2, 1947, four separate bills, as follows:

A bill embracing the language contained in titles I and V of said S. 1126;

A bill embracing the language contained in title II thereof;

A bill embracing the language contained in title III thereof; and

A bill embracing the language contained in title IV thereof.

I offer that motion, Mr. President, as I understand it is my parliamentary right to do, as a substitute motion for the one which I offered yesterday afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands; and the motion now submitted will be substituted for the motion previously made by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me explain what I think will be the effect of this motion if it is agreed to by the Senate. It will result in our having before us four new labor bills under new Senate numbers. Those bills, or any number of them, if passed, will go to the House as Senate bills and be placed on the House calendar. That will give to the House, if it cares to embrace it, an opportunity to vote on the legislation proposed by the Senate. In other words, it will give the House a chance, which I think some of the Members of the House would welcome after they have had the opportunity to reflect upon the implications and the meanings and effects of the Hartley bill, to go along with the Senate on its legislation. The House then could pass any one or all of the bills which the Senate might send over. Those bills would then go to conference, and out of the conference committee we would then get a report which the House and Senate could either vote up or vote down.

I think my proposal has a great many advantages. The first advantage is that it gives to the House, and certainly to the Senate, an opportunity to face separately the major issues as encompassed in the separate titles of Senate bill 1126, and to pass those that can be passed. Furthermore, if we separate this bill there will be less tendency, in my judgment, to try to incorporate amendments which might result in a veto.

I may be quite wrong about this, Mr. President, but no one as yet has been able to convince me that I am wrong. Even my associates on the Committee

on Labor and Public Welfare will testify that I have at least tried to work out conscionable compromises on various questions involved in the proposed legislation, and I think they must know that I am not averse to any fair compromise which will promote the possibility of securing the enactment of proper labor legislation. But no one as yet has been able to convince me that there is the remotest possibility of having signed by the President of the United States an omnibus bill of the nature which I think would come out of conference between the House and Senate. I cannot imagine the President signing the type of bill which I think will come out of that conference if it is in omnibus form. I may be wrong about it. If I am, then the responsibility in the last analysis will have to be shared both by the Congress and the President.

If the Senate continues the omnibus-bill approach it will send to conference a bill, with amendments which the Senate has added, for which some Members of the Senate cannot vote, and therefore there will be a sufficient number of Members of the Senate to vote to sustain a veto if the President vetoes the bill. Then the result will be that no legislation at all will be enacted.

So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to assume my share of responsibility for such final action. I am perfectly willing to make the choice of voting to defeat legislation of the omnibus type, containing many of the House provisions and some of the amendments which now are proposed in the Senate, rather than to have legislation of that type enacted into law.

So, Mr. President, when some of my colleagues talk about the practicalities of the situation, I am willing to talk on those terms. I think that one of the practicalities that confronts the Eightieth Congress is the likelihood that eventually there will be a veto of the bill and there will be a sufficient number of votes in the Senate to sustain the veto. In my judgment that would be a very unfortunate result and the action of Congress in passing such a bill would be most unfortunate. As I have said before, I think the people of the United States are entitled to have some labor legislation which will be fair and reasonable, and workable.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Will the Senator from Oregon tell us what information he has which convinces him so completely that if the bill now before the Senate is passed with certain provisions in it, the President will veto it, and that if it does not contain certain provisions the President will not veto it, but will sign it?

Mr. MORSE. I have no evidence at all; I merely have my own intuition and my confidence in the good judgment of the President.

Mr. BALL. Let me ask the Senator one more question, if he will further yield. Did the 6 weeks of hearings which the committee held and the several weeks of committee consideration

change the Senator's views regarding some of the provisions which should be included in this bill?

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from Minnesota knows that my views were changed in a number of respects during our conferences and our discussions.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will further yield, let me say I think that is quite true. I think that was true of all of us. It seems to me that the Senators who are arguing that the President will veto any bill are quoting from the President's state-of-the-Union message, which was delivered back in January, or from the President's veto of the Case bill, which was made a year ago, as a basis for sustaining their point; but it seems to me they are overlooking the fact that a great deal of water has gone over the dam since then. There have been extended hearings in both the House and Senate committees, and I think the President, as well as the Congress, will consider them.

Frankly, I do not think any Member of the Congress knows what the President will do, and I doubt that the President himself will know what he will do, until he receives a bill. Then he will have to decide, just as we in the Senate have to decide what we think are proper solution; to problems as we discuss them on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hope I have made it clear, as I believe I have, that the Senator from Oregon does not think he knows what the President will do in this matter. The Senator from Oregon has merely expressed an opinion; but, based upon his intuition and his appraisal of the good judgment of the President, that once the President receives a bill which has any resemblance to the Hartley bill, or a bill which has added to it the amendments which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] proposes, the Senator from Oregon simply cannot imagine that the President will sign such a bill. Let me say that my confidence in the President is too great to permit me to believe that the President would sign such a bill.

That is why I think that if the Senate passes a bill of that type, and if the bill is also passed by the House of Representatives, the bill is headed for a veto; and I think a sufficient number of the Members of the Senate would vote to sustain a veto. Therefore, I think we should avoid getting into such a situation.

Mr. President, that is why I think my good friend the Senator from Minnesota should follow my suggestion and should report from the committee a bill of the type which I have suggested, and thus let the Senate consider such a bill, pass it, and send it to conference.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I do not share the Senator's intuition regarding what the President will do. I recall that the President in his veto of the Case bill attacked very strongly the provision dealing with welfare funds. I think that the amendment which lies on the desks of Senators

improves a great deal the section of the bill dealing with that subject and makes it more workable. However, I notice that even after the President vetoed the Case bill he had his Secretary of the Interior abide by the provisions of that section in the agreement made with Mr. Lewis in regard to the coal mines.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Minnesota may be correct. We simply disagree insofar as our ideas of what the President may do are concerned.

I wish to avoid the possibility of a stalemate, with the result that no labor legislation at all will be enacted. I think we can avoid that possibility by following the procedure which I have suggested this afternoon. I am reasonably sure that we can avoid it if the Senator from Minnesota will only go along with me in regard to having reported from the committee the various bills I have suggested. Of course, I realize that the Senator's opinions and differences are honest and sincere, too.

So it seems to me that the next best course for the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Oregon to adopt, as at least a basis for resolving these differences, is for the Senator from Minnesota to go along with me in the way that I have suggested, so as at least to have the Senate send separate bills on these subjects to the House of Representatives. If, thereupon, the House is still of the same opinion, I suppose the House will not pass such separate bills. But I think it is fair to give the House of Representatives that chance. Moreover, Mr. President, we might be surprised by what the House would do; we might find the House grabbing at the opportunity to pass whatever proposed legislation the Senate sent to it.

The next point I wish to make about this so-called separable approach is that I think it is an approach which is fair to individual Members of the Senate as well, and I think we should try to accommodate ourselves, in all fairness, to the differences of conviction which occur among us. There are Members of the Senate who have said to me, "I would go along with the committee bill if it had this section or that section out of it, but I cannot support it in its present omnibus form."

Of course, each one of us naturally evaluates some proposed reforms more highly than others of us do. I think that the most important thing the Eightieth Congress could do, as a first step, would be to take action which would result in the passage of legislation amending the Wagner Act. I do not say this in any spirit of wishing to deprecate other portions of the bill reported by the committee, but I take this position, I suppose, because it is a point which I have made over and over again for a long time before many different groups—management groups, labor groups, and public groups. I have been saying, for years, subject to great criticism from some sources, that I think the Wagner Act needs to be amended in the direction of equalizing its effects upon both employers and unions. I have said, in the face of strenuous labor opposition, for a number of years—and this is a matter of

record—that the Wagner Act cannot possibly be fair until the rules are applied equally to both teams, so to speak, which are engaged in the game of industrial competition.

Mr. President, in title I of the bill before us it has been possible to incorporate many of the amendments to the Wagner Act which I have favored for a great many years. I should like to see all my colleagues in the Senate have a chance to vote on that title, as separate and distinct from the other titles of the bill. I believe that if they have a chance to vote on that title, title I, separately, in the form of a separate bill, it will pass the Senate by a surprisingly large majority vote, because, Mr. President, as I have circulated among my colleagues and have discussed title I, I have been pleased with the number of Senators who have said, "While it is not just the way I would have it in all respects, yet I must confess that you have brought from the committee a better set of proposals for amendments to the Wagner Act than I ever thought would be reported by the committee."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, was the Senator from Oregon here when the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] tore title I to pieces in his address today?

Mr. MORSE. I did not hear him tear it to pieces; I heard him speak of title I, and I think it stands in its totality, unimpaired by anything the Senator from Florida said about it. I think it will stand all the tests which may be applied to it. I do not say that all my colleagues think that title I is a good title, but I will say that I think that if title I were put into a separate bill, it would pass the Senate by a very large majority.

I think that would be a very healthy thing for labor relations. I think it would be a very constructive action. I think that in the long run labor would like to go along with the proposals we are making for equalizing the Wagner Act so as to serve the best interests of labor and employers as well.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Oregon care to take up the unanimous-consent request at this time?

Mr. MORSE. I am almost through, and I should like to have it taken up at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. No; I do not decline to yield. I merely told the Senator from Nebraska that I would take up at the end of my remarks the consent proposal he and I have discussed.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that I think title II of the bill should be voted upon by the Senate in a separate bill. I think it is a very sound title, proposed originally, in most of the points, by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Ives]. I think it is due to the Senator from New York that I should commend in this way the work he has performed in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Here again we found a man who has some very deep convictions about the way labor relations should be handled, who believes that, after all, we must cling to our voluntary procedure,

that we must develop to the maximum extent possible mediation, conciliation, and voluntary arbitration as the one and long time, lasting method for the peaceful solution of labor disputes. I think he is absolutely correct. I have entertained similar views for many years.

Mr. President, the Senator from New York went to work on a bill known as the Ives bill, seeking to handle the problem of mediation, conciliation, and arbitration, and seeking to develop procedure for the handling of the so-called national emergency or national paralysis cases. I think he has done an excellent piece of work. I was very glad to go along with the Senator from New York in title II of the bill, and vote to incorporate it as a part of the committee bill, when it became perfectly apparent, by a vote of the committee, that we could not have separate and distinct bills.

I think the Members of the Senate should have an opportunity to vote on that title II irrespective of their feelings about title I or title III or title IV, and I think it is a separable title. As said yesterday afternoon, we could pass in the form of separate bills any one of these titles, and put them on the statute books, and it would operate without any dependence upon any of the other titles of the bill.

True, as the Senator from Ohio said yesterday, all these titles involve or relate to collective bargaining, but the fact that they relate to collective bargaining does not mean that they are inseparable; it does not mean that they cannot be voted upon as separate bills. In my judgment, they should be voted upon in the form of separate bills. The point I am making is that we should be willing to accommodate ourselves to the conviction of individual Members of the Senate on the separate labor issues encompassed in the omnibus bill we are considering.

I think that wherever possible we should observe parliamentary courtesy. We should accommodate each other, making it possible for us to stand up and be counted on separable issues, and I think the pending bill is one which can be separated on the basis of separate issues that will enable us to accommodate our colleagues.

The last point I wish to make is one which was made yesterday in regard to allegations of motives. I am not interested in people's motives; I am interested in results. I am interested in securing the passage at this session of Congress of some labor legislation and having it signed by the President. Anything we can agree upon and get signed is a step forward.

I think it is true that, whether we like it or not, the omnibus bill approach is going to subject us to a type of criticism which I should like to avoid. I think it is going to subject us to the criticism that we are trying to put the President in the position of either having to sign a bill encompassing all these issues, or take action which will result in no legislation at all. I do not care how one may rationalize it, I do not care what language one may use in upholding his position in this matter, I say the result will be that the people of the country will say that we

played politics with the labor issue. I think we should place labor legislation above the level of politics in the Eightieth Congress. I believe we should follow the procedure which will make possible an unquestioned nonpartisan approach to the issues involved.

I submit, Mr. President, that it would be pretty difficult for anyone to charge successfully that separating this bill into its individual titles would involve any political approach to the problem. I think that would be the nonpartisan approach to labor legislation in the Eightieth Congress. It would not involve trying to put on the spot anyone in or out of the Congress or in or out of the White House. On the contrary, it seems to me it would recognize that there are great differences of opinion among us as to what type of legislation should be passed, differences of opinion which never can be reconciled under an omnibus bill, but which there is some chance of reconciling by way of separate bills. At least the separate approach would offer the possibility of Members of Congress getting together on some legislation which the President would sign.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, does not the Senator feel that the bill reported by the committee would be passed by the Senate by an overwhelming vote, and that it would not be vetoed by the President?

Mr. MORSE. I think the bill as reported by the committee, if it were not changed on the floor of the Senate, would pass by an overwhelming vote in the Senate, and while I cannot speak for the President, I cannot imagine his vetoing the bill. But I am not very hopeful that it will be possible to get the committee bill out of the Senate into conference without amendments attached to it which many of us cannot support. I think it is at that point the difficulty arises in regard to getting any legislation passed and signed by the President in the Eightieth Congress. If anyone could give me any assurance that the committee bill would be sent to conference without amendments being attached to it on the floor of the Senate, I should be willing then, in the interest of writing a conscionable compromise with my colleagues, to withdraw my motion, but I do not think that is going to be the result; hence, in the absence of such an agreement, I intend to press my motion.

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator from Oregon will yield for a moment, I regret very much that I must say to him that I cannot support his motion, because I think it would be a mistake at this time to recommit the bill. As the Senator knows, and as I have previously said, I felt that the right approach might be by separate bills, but I have yielded to the view of my colleagues that one bill is better and is easier to handle. I think we would make progress if we were willing to lay aside the amendments which have been or which may be offered, concentrate on the bill as it has been reported by the committee, pass it, send it to conference, and await the result of the conference. Such a course would avoid a great deal of debate and

much difficulty, and I had hoped that that might be done.

The Senator from Oregon suggested—and I think there is much to be said for it—that the Members of the Senate should have a right to pass on the separate issues. Senators who are offering amendments of one kind or another want to get expressions on them by their colleagues. Apparently that is the procedure we are going to follow. We cannot tell, until the vote is taken, whether the bill will be passed or not.

I should regret very much, Mr. President, if, because of amendments added to the bill, we could not present the solid front we had in the committee and send the bill to conference with evidence that there was a large majority of the Senate behind it.

The conference could then get together and determine the other issues, and we might finally get a bill we could send to the President with the hope and expectation, since he would know it was well supported, that he would sign it and not veto it.

I am entirely in accord with the Senator from Oregon that politics should be eliminated. I do not want the President to be "put on the spot." I want the President to be given a bill that he can sign. He wants legislation on this subject; Senators and Members of the other House want it, and it is very important for us and for the American people that legislation be passed that is fair and safe, on which the President and the Congress can agree, to relieve the pressure that is on the country from obvious abuses in the labor field.

In spite of what the distinguished Senator from Florida says, there are abuses that need correction. Everybody knows that to be so; and it is idle to say that this bill, if passed, would throw the country into turmoil and economic distress. I wish that we could in some way get together to pass a measure which would have the support of both Houses, as well as the support of the President, and which would remove evils the country is crying to have removed.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President—

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to say two things to the Senator from New Jersey, and then I will yield to the Senator from Utah. I appreciate very much the fair-minded attitude of the Senator from New Jersey in regard to the procedure that should be followed, which he has taken throughout our discussions.

It is true that the Senator from New Jersey, as he said, originally favored the separate-bill approach. When it was decided, as a matter of majority party policy, that there should be the omnibus approach, the Senator from New Jersey took the position that he should go along with the decision of the policy committee; and I thoroughly understand the merits of the Senator's taking that position.

I hold a different point of view, because I think the objective we should be seeking should be given greater weight than what I consider to be the mistaken policy, procedurally, followed by the ma-

ajority party in the Senate. I cannot escape the conclusion that it will result in no legislation. I cannot go along with the majority of my colleagues on this side, when they adopt a procedural policy which I think will result in no legislation, so long as I am convinced that, if we followed a different policy, we would have a greater chance of getting some legislation.

There was another point the Senator from New Jersey mentioned, on which I want to comment, namely, that it would be easier to handle one bill. I do not think our debate thus far substantiates that suggestion. In my opinion that is really an argument of form, without substance, because, if my motion is agreed to and the committee brings back four bills, the four bills, as the debate proceeds, will be discussed at one and the same time. There is no doubt about the fact that, as we discuss labor legislation, we shall be discussing each one of the four bills. When we come to a vote, we shall vote on them as separate bills, and we shall vote on separate amendments to the individual bills. I think hat when the smoke of debate clears away, we shall find that at least some of the separate bills will be in a form that will be practically assured of Presidential signature, and that will result in legislation. If I am wrong in the premises, then of course my whole argument falls, but I can only be proved wrong on it if we try that procedure to see whether or not it works; and I fully believe it will work. Of course, the Senator from New Jersey can be proved wrong in his theory only if we follow the omnibus-bill approach and it results in a veto, as I fully expect it will. So, as individual Senators, we have to make a choice as to which procedure we think will best promote the actual passing and signing of legislation in the Eightieth Congress.

I am convinced that the procedure I am proposing will do it, because by the motion I am now offering, I make it possible for the House of Representatives, irrespective of its action on the Hartley bill, to take action on any legislation that we, the Senate, may pass and send to it. Because of the procedure made available now by my new motion, I think I have at least answered, sufficiently to give it a trial, the arguments of those who say, "But we are met with the practical situation of a House omnibus bill facing us, that must go to conference." It will not be necessary to go to conference if we pass separate bills, if we send those bills to the House and the House sees fit to take action on them separately. I want to give the House that chance. I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I rise primarily to support the statement by the Senator from Oregon, but I think I could support it better if I knew the content of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MORSE. I think I had better state it now.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Oregon the

language that has already been formulated by the Parliamentarian.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Nebraska state it.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Wednesday, April 30, 1947, at the hour of 1 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to recommit to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with certain instructions the pending bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes, and that the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate on said day and the hour of 1 o'clock p. m. be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the said motion, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, are we to understand this agreement is offered by the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. WHERRY. We will concede that the unanimous-consent agreement is offered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who said he would ask that the language I had prepared be considered his language in presenting the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. TAFT. I can only say how pleased I am that the Senator from Oregon is willing to present a unanimous-consent agreement. Certainly I should not and would not object.

Mr. MORSE. I hope I am convincing the Senator from Ohio that, after all, I am a rather reasonable fellow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I might add that the distinguished Senator from Oregon has been most reasonable. We have worked together on this matter. My only reason for suggesting the language was that the Parliamentarian had drafted it, and I felt it would be acceptable to the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. There is no suggestion of reciprocal trading here, is there?

Mr. WHERRY. No; none whatever.

Mr. MORSE. We will let future events take care of that. I merely wanted to point out, Mr. President, that this involves solely a procedural matter. After all, we are either going to have a recommitment or we are not. I do not think there is much left in the way of substantive debate on the matter. We must choose our procedure, and I think the record is very clear that on purely procedural matters I usually go along with any fair unanimous-consent agreement. It is only when an effort is made to get me to agree to a unanimous-consent request that ends debate on what I consider to be an issue of great moment, when there is still ample need for full debate, that I do not go along; and of course, I shall not go along in the future with any such proposal, until I think the debate has been properly exhausted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. LUCAS. On what date does the proposed agreement become effective?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement provides that on the calendar day of Wednesday, April 30, at 1 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to recommit to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with certain instructions, the pending bill, S. 1126, and that the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate on said day—it has already been announced, as the Chair understands, that the Senate will meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.—and the hour of 1 o'clock p. m., be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of said motion, to be controlled respectively, by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that that means that the Senate will vote definitely at 1 o'clock, but not before?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 1 o'clock, as proposed in the unanimous-consent agreement.

Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I may add that the Senate not only will convene tomorrow at 11 o'clock, but will convene at 11 o'clock on the following days of this week when the Senate is in session, and that there will not be a night session of the Senate on Wednesday night, as was contemplated in the event the Senate did not proceed with the bill as fast as was thought necessary. So Members of the Senate should be advised that there will be no night session held on Wednesday, but that the Senate will convene at 11 o'clock for the remaining days of this week when the Senate is in session. Furthermore, it is not contemplated at this time that a session will be held on Saturday.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, am I to understand that the Senator from Nebraska is now telling the Senate that the Senate will meet every morning during the remainder of this week at 11 o'clock, without having the Senate pass on that question?

Mr. WHERRY. I can ask unanimous consent, if the Senator wants me to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. I was under the impression that the Senator was now telling the Senate that the Senate would convene tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well, I will make a motion. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to me for that purpose?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate convene at 11 o'clock a. m. during the remaining days of this week on the days when the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that the Senator can have his motion agreed to. I think, however, the proper procedure would be

to make the motion at the appropriate time.

Mr. WHERRY. I had expected to make the motion at the conclusion of today's session, but I felt that an announcement should be made at this time so Senators would be advised of what was contemplated with respect to the hour of meeting during the remainder of the week.

Mr. LUCAS. I know the able Senator from Nebraska has the majority on his side of the aisle so the motion will prevail, but I want him to know that he should not completely ignore the minority on a proposition of this kind.

Mr. WHERRY. I can assure the Senator that the minority will not be ignored. The Senator from Illinois is active and alert in seeing to it that the majority shall not be ignored.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I turn to another topic I am about to conclude my comments in support of my motion by saying that I think one of the best evidences we on both sides of the aisle could give to the American people that we are seeking to make a truly non-partisan approach to the subject, which it has a right to have, and that we are lifted above the level of politics, would be to carry out the suggestion I made yesterday, namely, that after we agree on procedure tomorrow, whether it is by way of omnibus bill or separate bills, a bipartisan committee of the Senate sit down and confer in an informal and friendly fashion with the President in regard to the whole problem of labor legislation, and see if there can be obtained some indication, one way or the other, of what the President's position will be. I think we have the right to know how far the President will go along in the passage of legislation at this session of Congress, and I think he in turn has the right to have such a consultation with us, so that there can be a mutual exchange of points of view concerning labor legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Oregon will suspend for a moment, the Chair understood the Senator from Oregon to yield to the Senator from Nebraska to permit him to make a motion with reference to the time of convening of the Senate for the remainder of the week. Does the Senator from Nebraska wish to press that motion at this time?

Mr. WHERRY. I withdraw that motion. I will offer it at the conclusion of the executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion made by the Senator from Nebraska is withdrawn at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that before we go forward with votes on the merits of proposed amendments and the committee-reported bill, that such a consultation with the President as I have suggested will be held. I do not think that such a consultation in any way would set a bad precedent; in fact, I think it would be a good precedent. Nor do I think it would in any way sacrifice any of the prerogatives of the Senate of the United States. Rather, I think it would be a clear demonstration, since we are confronted with the situation of having a

Congress of one party and a Chief Executive of another party, that the statement was sincerely made when at the beginning of the Eightieth Congress our leaders said in effect that they were willing to cooperate with the President on legislative problems, and would give him an opportunity to act on his expression of a desire to cooperate with the Congress.

EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEE RELATIONS IN THE SHIPBUILDING AND SHIP-REPAIR INDUSTRY

Now, Mr. President, I turn my attention to an entirely different subject, but one still somewhat related to the labor issues pending before the Congress. I turn my attention now for a few minutes to the problem of employer and employee relations in the shipbuilding and ship-repair industry. It is so easy for us, as we become engrossed in the problems of labor legislation, to forget that, after all, sound labor relations must rest upon parties to collective-bargaining agreements keeping their word under such agreements. As I said before, we cannot legislate good faith. We cannot legislate a willingness into the hearts of men to bargain collectively in good faith.

We hear a great many charges made about breaches of contract and breaches of agreement on the part of the union. There have been some. To the extent that there have been any, there have been too many, although I think any statistical analysis of the subject of breaches of contract by unions will produce the surprising finding that they are few and far between; that a great majority of union contracts are lived up to by the workers and by the employers. There are exceptions, and in order to provide for the exceptions two procedures are provided for in the bill as reported by the committee.

One procedure is found in the title which permits, of course, suits by employers against unions for breach of contract. That is subject to a great deal of criticism on the part of unions. I do not think the criticism is well founded, because in my opinion, when union officials sign a labor contract, their signature ought to be given the same sanctity and the same effect as the signature of an employer. So I am going along with the proposal for legislation which permits suits for breach of contract against unions. I think a careful reading by labor leaders of the particular proposal contained in the bill will dispel their minds of many of the exaggerated fears they seem to entertain. But, be that as it may, I think it is only fair and proper that when unions damage the property rights of employers or third parties as the result of breaches of contract, they should be held responsible for the obligation they took unto themselves when they signed the contract. However, I think it is also clear that most employers recognize that they do not build up harmonious labor relations by taking their workers into court. Litigation by way of court action is no solution to labor difficulties, and is not helpful in most instances in producing harmonious relations between employer and employee. We can take notice of that fact in re-

gard to suits in our courts between ordinary plaintiffs and defendants. I have yet to see very many plaintiffs or defendants, after they have lost a case, wish to carry on friendly relations thereafter with the winner of the case. Hence most employers tell us that they do not want to sue unions for breach of contract, because they must live with the unions and with the workers. Perhaps it is a legal remedy that ought to be made available to them in order to meet an intolerable situation which may develop, but they prefer another approach. They prefer an approach which would make breaches of contract an unfair labor practice. So in title I of the pending bill we make it possible for an employer to go before the National Labor Relations Board on petition and make his allegations as to the failure on the part of the union to live up to the obligations which it assumed when it signed the contract.

What are some typical breaches? Many contracts call for grievance machinery. It is agreed that instead of "quickie" strikes or economic action on the job, both parties will go through an agreed-upon grievance procedure. There are instances, as was pointed out to us in the hearings, of unions, when they think it is to their advantage, ignoring the grievance procedure; and when the employer points out to them that they are committed under the contract not to strike, but to submit the matter to the grievance procedure, ending ultimately in voluntary arbitration, there are occasions when the unions say, "Yes; we agreed to that, but we are not going to follow it, and so what?" That has brought certain unions into disrepute. It has done a great deal of injury to good unions which keep their word.

I think it is only fair to provide procedure in the bill which will make it possible for employers to prove their case against a union which engages in such an unfair labor practice, and obtain the remedies provided in the bill. I prefer that procedure. I believe that one of the sound features of the bill is that it provides a dual procedure. It makes it possible for employers to use the unfair labor practice procedure, which is also available to unions, in case of a violation of contract on the part of employers. In other words, it balances the act. It applies the same rule to both teams.

I should like to make clear in this discussion this afternoon that there are also many instances of employers not living up to their obligations under a contract. I have arbitrated a good many labor disputes in my professional career, and in a considerable number of disputes I have found the employers acting in violation of their contracts and have had to so hold in my decision, as I have done in the case of unions when they have not lived up to the contracts made over their signatures. I have dealt with employers who have at least lived up to their agreement to arbitrate the question as to whether or not they were in violation of their contracts.

However, in recent days I have been discussing with Mr. John Green, president of one of the maritime trade unions, a very serious situation which seems to

be developing in the shipbuilding and ship-repair industry. I presume that in most of these disputes there are two sides to the case. However, I wish to place in the RECORD this afternoon what I am satisfied has been the history of the so-called zone-standards agreement which was adopted during the war, covering wage stabilization in the shipbuilding industry. I wish to place it in the RECORD because I am of the opinion that we are headed for serious trouble in the shipbuilding industry unless the employers and workers can get together in carrying out their obligations under the zone-standards agreement.

Since 1941 the shipbuilding and ship-repair industry has been functioning under a tripartite agreement between industry, labor, and Government, known as the Zone Standards, administered by the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee. It is of great moment and concern to the east coast, the Gulf, the west coast, and the Lakes.

At present this agreement is under the danger of being unilaterally abrogated by the employers. I understand that management has failed to have a quorum of its representatives present at the last two meetings of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee.

It seems that management, by thus obstructing the business of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee, is not abiding by the terms of a tripartite agreement to which the Government is signatory, and which is still in full force and effect.

The story of shipbuilding stabilization in the United States is one of the little-known stories of good labor relations in the past. The story of shipbuilding stabilization in the future, because of the refusal of management to abide by its word, and because of the failure of the Government to live up to the sanctions which could be imposed upon a recalcitrant party, may become a better-known story of bad labor relations, if the employers and the workers engaged in this industry do not proceed to get together on their problems short of economic action.

The story of shipbuilding stabilization begins in 1940, at which time Mr. Sidney Hillman, at that time commissioner in charge of the Labor Division of the National Defense Advisory Commission—subsequently appointed associate director general of the Office of Production Management—announced the creation of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee, composed of representatives of labor, the shipbuilding industry, the United States Navy, the United States Maritime Commission, and the OPM.

The shipbuilding industry group which met to formulate a policy for the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee was truly representative of the views of management, because the 21 members present represented 42 yards employing at least 90 percent of the workers in the industry. It cannot be said that management was forced into its participation in the shipbuilding stabilization agreements. All of the parties agreed that the zone standards agreements were

to be formulated by national zonal conferences in four zones, and were to be arrived at by a process of collective bargaining resulting in unanimous concurrence with the provisions of the agreements. That was the agreement resulting in unanimous concurrence with the provisions of the zone standards agreement.

The first zone standards agreement to be negotiated was one covering all shipyards doing new construction work on the Pacific coast. The Bethlehem Steel Co., shipbuilding division, declined to participate in the conference to formulate the agreement on this coast, but declared its willingness to abide by the working standards agreed upon by the conference.

The Senate will recall that it was in 1945 that we had a wage differential problem involving repair yards, when I spoke at some length on the shipbuilding labor relations on the west coast. We worked out at that time, to the credit of the workers and of the shipping concerns, a satisfactory solution of that problem. I am hopeful that here, again, the shipbuilders and the unions may reach some agreement as to their respective equities. Apparently both sides are taking somewhat extreme positions and the problem is one of ironing out the respective equities of the parties as they have developed under the zone standard agreement.

The agreement drawn up on the Pacific coast was submitted to the principals and reviewed and accepted by them, including management, the procurement agencies representing Government, and labor. This Pacific zone standards agreement merely set general principles. In this Pacific conference at the first session only labor and management were active conferees. In all other sessions and conferences, the Government took an active part.

The Pacific coast zone conference finished formulation of the zone standards on April 21, 1941. The three remaining zone conferences were held as scheduled for the Gulf coast, the Atlantic coast, and the Great Lakes. The Gulf coast zone standards agreement was more detailed than those of the other zones, because both the employers and the union representatives on the Gulf coast wanted to incorporate the zone standards bodily into local agreements rather than to translate general working conditions into specific clauses.

All four zone standards agreements set the following types of working conditions: Standard skilled mechanics' rate on all zones but the Gulf, \$1.12. Gulf zone, \$1.07. Overtime rates. Night shift premium. No strike and no lock-out pledge. Agreement on arbitration for all disputes. A provision against limitation on production. A duration clause.

The zone standards were not local collective bargaining agreements. The provisions of the zone standards agreements were incorporated into the local agreements, sometimes in toto and sometimes by reference. They were zonal agreements between management, Government, and labor.

It was felt that the shipbuilding stabilization committee alone, under whose auspices the zone conferences were called, would have the power to interpret the zone standards.

In 1942 the shipbuilding stabilization committee was revised. Industry evinced a desire to have 12 representatives instead of 6—industry acted through the National Council of American Shipbuilders—and later it again increased representation. The Government added 2 representatives of the War Department.

In 1942 it was decided that the four zone stabilization agreements required amendment and a national shipbuilders' conference was held in Chicago on April 27, to draw up amendments to the zone standards. These amendments were adopted by unanimous consent of the Army, the Navy, the Maritime Commission, and the War Production Board, representing the Government, by the Metal Trades Department of the A. F. of L., and the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, of the CIO, representing labor, and by the various shipbuilding corporations representing industry. These amendments provided two things which are germane today:

First. The holding of a yearly wage review under a procedure to be developed by the shipbuilding stabilization committee.

Second. The zone standards agreements were to apply for the duration of the national emergency, as proclaimed by the President of the United States.

Thus the only way, under the zone-standard agreements, that wages could be altered in the shipbuilding industry was by a wage review held by Government, management, and labor, and which was to apply to all shipyards covered by the zone standards in the United States.

Because of the issuance on October 3, 1942, of Executive Order 9250, the wage reviews of 1943 and 1944 as outlined by the Chicago amendments to the zone-standard agreements were held by the National War Labor Board. The wage review for 1945 was held by the National Shipbuilding Conference in Colorado Springs, where an 18-cents-per-hour increase was granted by majority vote of Government and labor, with management dissenting. However, all parties to the Colorado national conference agreed that the zone standards themselves could only be amended by unanimous consent.

Since the 1945 wage review had been postponed until December, it was felt by the stabilization committee that to hold the 1946 wage review at the customary time—in June—would be meaningless. Therefore, the stabilization committee voted to hold the 1946 wage review in January of 1947. The shipbuilding workers still have an equity in the 1946 wage review, which has not yet been held. Even if the national emergency were declared at an end by the President of the United States or by joint resolution of Congress, the equity of the workers in the 1946 wage review to be conducted under the auspices of the shipbuilding stabilization committee would still remain, and the review, ac-

ording to the promise of the committee, would still have to be held.

Since the wage review of 1945, management has been taking the attitude that the zone-standard agreements should be done away with, even prior to the end of the national emergency.

Perhaps it should be, Mr. President, but the point I want to stress is that they ought to sit down and negotiate by collective bargaining about it, because I think that is the obligation to which they have committed themselves. As a matter of fact, eight management members of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee have submitted their resignations to this committee. Management does not want to abide by its agreement of 1941 and 1942. It is trying unilaterally to dissolve its collective-bargaining contract. Labor takes the position that management cannot be allowed unilaterally to dissolve a collective-bargaining agreement, even though such agreement be national in its scope. The unions take the position that management must abide by its contract and by its pledged word.

The termination of the zone standards agreements was set by the Chicago amendment to such agreements at the end of the national emergency. This termination date can be changed only by the unanimous consent of all parties, because to change this date would be amending the zone standards. Moreover, to change participation in the zone standards agreements can be done only by unanimous consent, because it would, in effect, be amending these standards.

Perhaps they should not have entered into that agreement. Many people have been before me in arbitration cases by agreement and have argued that they entered into a bad agreement, an agreement which was working to their disadvantage. I do not know whether this is or is not working to the disadvantage of the employer, but the fact that they may have entered into an agreement which they do not now like does not justify, it seems to me, their seeking to change it except through the processes of collective bargaining to which they have committed themselves.

Thus, one party cannot withdraw without the consent of the other two. The termination date of the Zone Standards Agreements cannot be changed except by the unanimous consent of the parties.

During the wage review of 1945, the Government procurement agencies indicated their desire to withdraw from participation in the national conference, although promising to recognize the force and effect of the Zone Standards Agreements. I do not think, in this connection, that the Government agencies have absolutely clean hands either. I think that is another matter which ought to be looked into in an attempt to avoid a break-down in successful collective bargaining between and among the parties involved in this arrangement.

Both management and labor refused to allow a party to the Zone Standards to withdraw without unanimous consent, and would not give the Government agencies consent to withdraw.

Management has attempted to stop the working of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee itself by refusing to have a quorum present at the last two meetings of the committee. This is an indirect method of single-handed and arbitrary elimination of responsibility under the collective agreements.

Mr. John Green, president of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, assures me that he has always taken the position that the Zone Standards Agreements and the Stabilization Committee should be continued after the termination of the state of national emergency, as proclaimed by the President of the United States. The other two parties to the Zone Standards Agreements, namely, management and Government, have refused to agree to the proposal to extend the termination date of the Zone Standards Agreements. In turn, they cannot shorten or abridge the termination date of the Zone Standards Agreements without unanimous consent, nor can they destroy the previous action of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee setting the 1946 wage review date for January 1947 without destroying the effectiveness of the Zone Standards Agreements.

Even when the President of the United States abolished all wage and salary controls, he recognized the equity of labor in awards and gains previously granted by the wage and salary stabilization bodies.

The shipbuilding workers have such an equity in the 1946 wage review. It is this equity to which I seek to draw attention this afternoon. It should not be destroyed.

In my judgment it cannot be destroyed without a complete abrogation of the tripartite-collective agreement.

The amendments to the zone standards agreements adopted at Chicago, specifically stated the following with regard to the wage review:

The rates herein established and put into effect shall remain in effect until June 1, 1943, on or about which date a wage review shall be conducted under procedures to be developed by the shipbuilding stabilization committee and thereafter annually on or about June 1, a like review will be conducted by that committee.

The management by refusing to allow a quorum of its representation to be present at the last two meetings of the stabilization committee, and thus obstructing the conduct of the wage review, is not abiding by the terms of its contract, which is still in full force and effect. At least, Mr. President, that is the allegation of the union, and I think that allegation should be appraised and considered in negotiations entered into in good faith by all parties to the agreement.

The record of the shipbuilding industry has been a most impressive one. Since 1941 there have been no major strikes in that industry. Mr. President, that is a remarkable record. It is a record for which I think all the maritime unions, irrespective of their affiliations, deserve a great deal of credit.

Because of the operation of the zone standards, the shipbuilding industry was one of the few to avert a strike in 1946,

even though the employers in this industry are the same in many cases as those in the steel industry, such as United States Steel Corp. and Bethlehem Steel Corp. Because of the operation of the zone standards, the wage increase granted in 1946 was attained peacefully, through the national conference to conduct the wage review of 1945.

Postponement of the 1946 wage review until on or about January 1, 1947, was made on a motion by Mr. Edward J. Tracey of the United States Maritime Commission, and it was seconded by Capt. Harold J. Wright of the United States Navy. That motion even did away with retroactivity of wages prior to January 1, 1947.

In a letter addressed to the President of the United States, John Green, president of the Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America, stated:

Before the zone-standards agreements can be terminated and the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee can be dissolved, all obligations undertaken under such agreements must be fulfilled.

This is a clear case in which the United States Government must show its impartiality and fairness. The motion on the basis of which the 1946 wage review was postponed was made and seconded by the representatives of the Government of the United States.

In this case the entire American sense of fair play demands that the Government live up to the sense of, and obligations under, its contract and use its utmost influence to persuade industry to do the same.

I hope, Mr. President, that you will give this situation your serious and considered attention. The sanctity of any agreement to which the Government is a party is not a matter which should be threatened by any single, self-seeking group.

In its consideration of labor legislation, the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives have been taking the attitude that labor must be forced to live up to its just obligations. I think that is a proper attitude for us to take.

Here is a case in which labor claims it has lived up to its just obligations, and I think the record supports its claim. The union which is involved has engaged in a major battle to save the very industry in which it is working, and to save the American merchant marine. Within the past few months, we have all had on our desks the pamphlets and books of this union on the serious problem faced by the American merchant marine. What is management doing in this case? To all intents and purposes, management is forcing the union into a situation where it must either, first, allow management to abrogate a tripartite agreement which has been signed and approved by the Government of the United States; or, second, strike. I do not think there is any justification for provocation of a strike because of any failure of management to live up to its agreements. I do not think there is any justification for a union to strike before it has carried out the terms of its collective-bargaining commitments. In this case, the union claims—and I think it has made out a prima facie case—that it has lived up to its obligations, and

that the party that is in error insofar as not living up to the collective-bargaining agreement is concerned, happens to be, in this instance, the employer.

The procurement agencies of the Government have the power to request that the shipbuilding corporations of the United States live up to their agreements. That has not been done.

The union is not asking that management even grant a wage increase; the union has simply been asking for the possibility of bargaining for a wage increase. In view of the legislation that the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States are thinking of, to compel labor to live up to its just obligations—and not only am I supporting such legislation, but I have proposed some of it—it seems to me that it is extremely necessary that such legislation take note of the refusal of management in some cases to live up to its just obligations, even when those obligations have been incurred under a solemn contract entered into with labor and the Government of the United States.

Hence, Mr. President, in closing my discussion of this question, I wish to make two points: First, I sincerely hope that the shipbuilders of the United States who are involved in these Zone Standards agreements will reflect upon the course of action they are following in not making it possible even to have a quorum present at the committee meetings, so that they can thrash out in good faith the collective-bargaining differences which exist between and among the Government, the union, and the shipbuilders; and, second, I think we need to keep in mind, as we consider legislation which seeks to enforce the contract obligations on the part of both unions and employers, that sometimes employers, too, are guilty of contract violations, thus providing all the more reason, it seems to me, why we should balance the Wagner Act with procedure which will make it possible to hold both employers and unions guilty of an unfair-labor practice when they violate the sanctity of their signatures affixed to a collective-bargaining agreement.

EXEMPTION OF EMPLOYERS FROM LIABILITY FOR PORTAL-TO-PORTAL WAGES IN CERTAIN CASES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WILEY submitted the following conference report, which was ordered to lie on the table:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2157) to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PART I

"Findings and policy

"SECTION 1. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938,

as amended, has been interpreted judicially in disregard of long-established customs, practices, and contracts between employers and employees, thereby creating wholly unexpected liabilities, immense in amount and retroactive in operation, upon employers with the results that, if said Act as so interpreted or claims arising under such interpretations were permitted to stand, (1) the payment of such liabilities would bring about financial ruin of many employers and seriously impair the capital resources of many others, thereby resulting in the reduction of industrial operations, halting of expansion and development, curtailing employment, and the earning power of employees; (2) the credit of many employers would be seriously impaired; (3) there would be created both an extended and continuous uncertainty on the part of industry, both employer and employee, as to the financial condition of productive establishments and a gross inequality of competitive conditions between employers and between industries; (4) employees would receive windfall payments, including liquidated damages, of sums for activities performed by them without any expectation of reward beyond that included in their agreed rates of pay; (5) there would occur the promotion of increasing demands for payment to employees for engaging in activities no compensation for which had been contemplated by either the employer or employee at the time they were engaged in; (6) voluntary collective bargaining would be interfered with and industrial disputes between employees and employers and between employees and employees would be created; (7) the courts of the country would be burdened with excessive and needless litigation and champertous practices would be encouraged; (8) the Public Treasury would be deprived of large sums of revenues and public finances would be seriously deranged by claims against the Public Treasury for refunds of taxes already paid; (9) the cost to the Government of goods and services heretofore and hereafter purchased by its various departments and agencies would be unreasonably increased and the Public Treasury would be seriously affected by consequent increased cost of war contracts; and (10) serious and adverse effects upon the revenues of Federal, State, and local governments would occur.

"The Congress further finds that all of the foregoing constitutes a substantial burden on commerce and a substantial obstruction to the free flow of goods in commerce.

"The Congress, therefore, further finds and declares that it is in the national public interest and for the general welfare, essential to national defense, and necessary to aid, protect, and foster commerce, that this Act be enacted.

"The Congress further finds that the varying and extended periods of time for which, under the laws of the several States, potential retroactive liability may be imposed upon employers, have given and will give rise to great difficulties in the sound and orderly conduct of business and industry.

"The Congress further finds and declares that all of the results which have arisen or may arise under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, as aforesaid, may (except as to liability for liquidated damages) arise with respect to the Walsh-Healey and Bacon-Davis Acts and that it is, therefore, in the national public interest and for the general welfare, essential to national defense, and necessary to aid, protect, and foster commerce, that this Act shall apply to the Walsh-Healey Act and the Bacon-Davis Act.

"(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress in order to meet the existing emergency and to correct existing evils (1) to relieve and protect interstate commerce from practices which burden and obstruct it; (2) to protect the right of collective bargaining; and (3) to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts.

"PART II

"Existing claims

"SEC. 2. RELIEF FROM CERTAIN EXISTING CLAIMS UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, THE WALSH-HEALEY ACT, AND THE BACON-DAVIS ACT.—

"(a) No employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act (in any action or proceeding commenced prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this Act), on account of the failure of such employer to pay an employee minimum wages, or to pay an employee overtime compensation, for or on account of any activity of an employee engaged in prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, except an activity which was compensable by either—

"(1) an express provision of a written or nonwritten contract in effect, at the time of such activity, between such employee, his agent, or collective-bargaining representative and his employer; or

"(2) a custom or practice in effect, at the time of such activity, at the establishment or other place where such employee was employed, covering such activity, not inconsistent with a written or nonwritten contract, in effect at the time of such activity, between such employee, his agent, or collective-bargaining representative and his employer.

"(b) For the purposes of subsection (a), an activity shall be considered as compensable under such contract provision or such custom or practice only when it was engaged in during the portion of the day with respect to which it was so made compensable.

"(c) In the application of the minimum wage and overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, of the Walsh-Healey Act, or of the Bacon-Davis Act, in determining the time for which an employer employed an employee there shall be counted all that time, but only that time, during which the employee engaged in activities which were compensable within the meaning of subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

"(d) No court of the United States, of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or of the District of Columbia, shall have jurisdiction of any action or proceeding, whether instituted prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, to enforce liability or impose punishment for or on account of the failure of the employer to pay minimum wages or overtime compensation under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, under the Walsh-Healey Act, or under the Bacon-Davis Act, to the extent that such action or proceeding seeks to enforce any liability or impose any punishment with respect to an activity which was not compensable under subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

"(e) No cause of action based on unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, or liquidated damages, under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act, which accrued prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, or any interest in such cause of action, shall hereafter be assignable, in whole or in part, to the extent that such cause of action is based on an activity which was not compensable within the meaning of subsections (a) and (b).

"SEC. 3. COMPROMISE OF CERTAIN EXISTING CLAIMS UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, THE WALSH-HEALEY ACT, AND THE BACON-DAVIS ACT.—

"(a) Any cause of action under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act, which accrued prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, or any action (whether instituted prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this Act) to

enforce such a cause of action, may hereafter be compromised in whole or in part, if there exists a bona fide dispute as to the amount payable by the employer to his employee; except that no such action or cause of action may be so compromised to the extent that such compromise is based on an hourly wage rate less than the minimum required under such Act, or on a payment for overtime at a rate less than one and one-half times such minimum hourly wage rate.

"(b) Any employee may hereafter waive his right under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to liquidated damages, in whole or in part, with respect to activities engaged in prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(c) Any such compromise or waiver, in the absence of fraud or duress, shall, according to the terms thereof, be a complete satisfaction of such cause of action and a complete bar to any action based on such cause of action.

"(d) The provisions of this section shall also be applicable to any compromise or waiver heretofore so made or given.

"(e) As used in this section, the term 'compromise' includes 'adjustment', 'settlement', and 'release'.

"PART III

"Future claims

"SEC. 4. RELIEF FROM CERTAIN FUTURE CLAIMS UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, THE WALSH-HEALEY ACT, AND THE BACON-DAVIS ACT.—

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), no employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act, on account of the failure of such employer to pay an employee minimum wages, or to pay an employee overtime compensation, for or on account of any of the following activities of such employee engaged in on or after the date of the enactment of this Act—

"(1) walking, riding, or traveling to and from the actual place of performance of the principal activity or activities which such employee is employed to perform, and

"(2) activities which are preliminary to or postliminary to said principal activity or activities,

which occur either prior to the time on any particular workday at which such employee commences, or subsequent to the time on any particular workday at which he ceases, such principal activity or activities.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) which relieve an employer from liability and punishment with respect to an activity, the employer shall not be so relieved if such activity is compensable by either—

"(1) an express provision of a written or nonwritten contract in effect, at the time of such activity, between such employee, his agent, or collective-bargaining representative and his employer; or

"(2) a custom or practice in effect, at the time of such activity, at the establishment or other place where such employee is employed, covering such activity, not inconsistent with a written or nonwritten contract, in effect at the time of such activity, between such employee, his agent, or collective-bargaining representative and his employer.

"(c) For the purposes of subsection (b), an activity shall be considered as compensable under such contract provision or such custom or practice only when it is engaged in during the portion of the day with respect to which it is so made compensable.

"(d) In the application of the minimum wage and overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, of the Walsh-Healey Act, or of the Bacon-Davis Act, in determining the time for which an employer employs an employee

with respect to walking, riding, traveling, or other preliminary or postliminary activities described in subsection (a) of this section, there shall be counted all that time, but only that time, during which the employee engages in any such activity which is compensable within the meaning of subsections (b) and (c) of this section.

"PART IV
"Miscellaneous

"SEC. 5. REPRESENTATIVE ACTIONS BANNED.—

"(a) The second sentence of section 16 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'Action to recover such liability may be maintained in any court of competent jurisdiction by any one or more employees for and in behalf of himself or themselves and other employees similarly situated. No employee shall be a party plaintiff to any such action unless he gives his consent in writing to become such a party and such consent is filed in the court in which such action is brought.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be applicable only with respect to actions commenced under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 6. STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—Any action commenced on or after the date of the enactment of this Act to enforce any cause of action for unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, or liquidated damages, under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act—

"(a) if the cause of action accrues on or after the date of the enactment of this Act—may be commenced within two years after the cause of action accrued, and every such action shall be forever barred unless commenced within two years after the cause of action accrued;

"(b) if the cause of action accrued prior to the date of the enactment of this Act—may be commenced within whichever of the following periods is the shorter: (1) two years after the cause of action accrued, or (2) the period prescribed by the applicable State statute of limitations; and, except as provided in paragraph (c), every such action shall be forever barred unless commenced within the shorter of such two periods;

"(c) if the cause of action accrued prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, the action shall not be barred by paragraph (b) if it is commenced within one hundred and twenty days after the date of the enactment of this Act unless at the time commenced it is barred by an applicable State statute of limitations.

"SEC. 7. DETERMINATION OF COMMENCEMENT OF FUTURE ACTIONS.—In determining when an action is commenced for the purposes of section 6, an action commenced on or after the date of the enactment of this Act under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act, shall be considered to be commenced on the date when the complaint is filed; except that in the case of a collective or class action instituted under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or the Bacon-Davis Act, it shall be considered to be commenced in the case of any individual claimant—

"(a) on the date when the complaint is filed, if he is specifically named as a party plaintiff in the complaint and his written consent to become a party plaintiff is filed on such date in the court in which the action is brought; or

"(b) if such written consent was not so filed, if his name did not so appear—on the subsequent date on which such written consent is filed in the court in which the action was commenced.

"SEC. 8. PENDING COLLECTIVE AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTIONS.—The statute of limita-

tions prescribed in section 6 (b) shall also be applicable (in the case of a collective or representative action commenced prior to the date of the enactment of this Act under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended) to an individual claimant who has not been specifically named as a party plaintiff to the action prior to the expiration of one hundred and twenty days after the date of the enactment of this Act. In the application of such statute of limitations such action shall be considered to have been commenced as to him when, and only when, his written consent to become a party plaintiff to the action is filed in the court in which the action was brought.

"SEC. 9. RELIANCE ON PAST ADMINISTRATIVE RULINGS, ETC.—In any action or proceeding commenced prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this Act based on any act or omission prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, no employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment for or on account of the failure of the employer to pay minimum wages or overtime compensation under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act or the Bacon-Davis Act, if he pleads and proves that the act or omission complained of was in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on any administrative regulation, order, ruling, approval, or interpretation, of any agency of the United States, or any administrative practice or enforcement policy of any such agency with respect to the class of employers to which he belonged. Such a defense, if established, shall be a bar to the action or proceeding, notwithstanding that after such act or omission, such administrative regulation, order, ruling, approval, interpretation, practice, or enforcement policy is modified or rescinded or is determined by judicial authority to be invalid or of no legal effect.

"SEC. 10. RELIANCE IN FUTURE ON ADMINISTRATIVE RULINGS, ETC.—

"(a) In any action or proceeding based on any act or omission on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, no employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment for or on account of the failure of the employer to pay minimum wages or overtime compensation under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act, if he pleads and proves that the act or omission complained of was in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on any written administrative regulation, order, ruling, approval, or interpretation, of the agency of the United States specified in subsection (b) of this section, or any administrative practice or enforcement policy of such agency with respect to the class of employers to which he belonged. Such a defense, if established, shall be a bar to the action or proceeding, notwithstanding that after such act or omission, such administrative regulation, order, ruling, approval, interpretation, practice, or enforcement policy is modified or rescinded or is determined by judicial authority to be invalid or of no legal effect.

"(b) The agency referred to in subsection (a) shall be—

"(1) in the case of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended—the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor;

"(2) in the case of the Walsh-Healey Act—the Secretary of Labor, or any Federal officer utilized by him in the administration of such Act; and

"(3) in the case of the Bacon-Davis Act—the Secretary of Labor.

"SEC. 11. LIQUIDATED DAMAGES.—In any action commenced prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this Act to recover unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, or liquidated damages, under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, if the employer shows to the satis-

faction of the court that the act or omission giving rise to such action was in good faith and that he had reasonable grounds for believing that his act or omission was not a violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the court may, in its sound discretion, award no liquidated damages or award any amount thereof not to exceed the amount specified in section 16 (b) of such Act.

"SEC. 12. APPLICABILITY OF 'AREA OF PRODUCTION' REGULATIONS.—No employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, on account of the failure of such employer to pay an employee minimum wages, or to pay an employee overtime compensation, for or on account of an activity engaged in by such employee prior to December 26, 1946, if such employer—

"(1) was not so subject by reason of the definition of an 'area of production,' by a regulation of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, which regulation was applicable at the time of performance of the activity even though at that time the regulation was invalid; or

"(2) would not have been so subject if the regulation signed on December 18, 1946 (Federal Register, Vol. 11, p. 14648), had been in force on and after October 24, 1938.

"SEC. 13. DEFINITIONS.—

"(a) When the terms 'employer,' 'employee,' and 'wage' are used in this Act in relation to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, they shall have the same meaning as when used in such Act of 1938.

"(b) When the term 'employer' is used in this Act in relation to the Walsh-Healey Act or Bacon-Davis Act it shall mean the contractor or subcontractor covered by such Act.

"(c) When the term 'employee' is used in this Act in relation to the Walsh-Healey Act or the Bacon-Davis Act it shall mean any individual employed by the contractor or subcontractor covered by such Act in the performance of his contract or subcontract.

"(d) The term 'Walsh-Healey Act' means the Act entitled 'An Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes,' approved June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2036), as amended; and the term 'Bacon-Davis Act' means the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Act approved March 3, 1931, relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on public buildings,' approved August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1011), as amended.

"(e) As used in section 6, the term 'State' means any State of the United States or the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession of the United States.

"SEC. 14. SEPARABILITY.—If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 15. SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the 'Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.
Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to relieve employers from certain liabilities and punishments under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the Bacon-Davis Act, and for other purposes".

ALEXANDER WILEY,
FORREST C. DONNELL,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

EARL C. MICHENER,
JOHN W. GWYNNE,
ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any reports of committees? If there be none, the Clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joe B. Dooley to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that this nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, may I inquire what was done with the Dooley nomination?

Mr. WHERRY. I asked unanimous consent that it be passed over, and that was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the Senator from Nebraska as to what has happened to the nomination of Marvin Jones to become Chief Justice of the Court of Claims?

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot advise the Senator as to what has happened. I shall be glad to look into it and report to him.

Mr. LUCAS. It has been pending for a long time before the Committee on the Judiciary, and those of us who served with Marvin Jones in the House of Representatives realize what a grand person he is. He was a Member of Congress for 24 years, and for 10 years served as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. The able Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and I served with him on many other committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary gave notice a couple of weeks ago that the hearing on this nomination was imminent, and that notice has been printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. What did he mean by its being imminent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is unable to say.

Mr. LUCAS. If I may make a short statement about Mr. Marvin Jones, I hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will act with some expedition and speed in connection with the nomination of this very good man. If there is anything against him I do not know it, and I doubt if anyone else knows of anything against him. He certainly is qualified, and he is now a member of the Court of Claims. He never asked me to

do anything about his nomination, but as his friend I was curious to know what had happened to it. I thought perhaps that, like the budget reduction proposal, it had gotten lost between here and some other place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Drake Watson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Benjamin Scott Whaley to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed. That completes the executive calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 30, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 29 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for promotion in the Foreign Service of the United States of America:

FROM FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 2 TO FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 1

Paul H. Alling, of Connecticut.
Charles E. Bohlen, of Massachusetts.
William W. Butterworth, Jr., of Louisiana.
John M. Cabot, of Massachusetts.
Paul C. Daniels, of New York.
Howard Donovan, of Illinois.
David McK. Key, of Tennessee.
Edward B. Lawson, of the District of Columbia.
Warwick Perkins, of Maryland.
Edwin A. Plitt, of Maryland.
Karl L. Rankin, of Maine.
James W. Riddleberger, of Virginia.

FROM FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 3 TO FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 2

Theodore C. Achilles, of the District of Columbia.
John M. Allison, of Nebraska.
H. Merrell Benninghoff, of New York.
James C. H. Bonbright, of New York.
Philip W. Bonsal, of the District of Columbia.

John H. Bruins, of New York.
Homer M. Byington, Jr., of Connecticut.
Cavendish W. Cannon, of Utah.
Vinton Chapin, of Massachusetts.
Warren M. Chase, of Indiana.
Oliver Edmund Clubb, of Minnesota.
William P. Cochran, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Robert D. Coe, of Wyoming.
Gerald A. Drew, of California.
Everett F. Drumright, of Oklahoma.
Elbridge Durbrow, of California.
Walton C. Ferris, of Wisconsin.
Raymond A. Hare, of Iowa.

Cloyce K. Huston, of Iowa.
Gerald Keith, of Illinois.
John B. Ketcham, of New York.
Charles F. Knox, Jr., of New Jersey.
Foy D. Kohler, of Ohio.
Hervé J. L'Heureux, of New Hampshire.
John H. Madonne, of Texas.
Sheldon T. Mills, of Oregon.
Harold B. Minor, of Kansas.
James K. Penfield, of California.
Guy W. Ray, of Alabama.
Edward J. Sparks, of New York.
Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., of Colorado.
Edward T. Wailes, of New York.
Thomas C. Wasson, of New Jersey.
James H. Wright, of Missouri.

FROM FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 5 TO FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 4

Charles W. Adair, Jr., of Ohio.
H. Gardner Ainsworth, of Louisiana.
John H. Burns, of Oklahoma.
Donald B. Calder, of New York.
V. Lansing Collins, Jr., of New York.
Leonard J. Cromie, of Connecticut.
Richard H. Davis, of New York.
Irven M. Eitrem, of South Dakota.
Robert S. Folsom, of Massachusetts.
Edward L. Freers, of Ohio.
Paul E. Geier, of Ohio.
Lewis E. Gleeck, Jr., of Illinois.
Richard E. Gnade, of Pennsylvania.
Caspar D. Green, of Ohio.
Franklin Hawley, of Michigan.
Martin J. Hillenbrand, of Illinois.
John P. Hoover, of California.
John Evarts Horner, of Colorado.
Richard A. Johnson, of Illinois.
J. Jefferson Jones 3d, of Tennessee.
M. Gordon Knox, of Maryland.
William L. Krieg, of Ohio.
Sidney K. Lafoon, of Virginia.
Donald W. Lamm, of the District of Columbia.

Robert H. McBride, of Michigan.
David H. McKillop, of Massachusetts.
John M. McSweeney, of Massachusetts.
Albert E. Pappano, of Ohio.
Milton C. Rewinkel, of Minnesota.
Stuart W. Rockwell, of Pennsylvania.
William Langdon Sands, of Florida.
Bromley K. Smith, of California.
Henry T. Smith, of Georgia.
John W. Tutthill, of Massachusetts.
J. Kittredge Vinson, of Texas.
William W. Walker, of North Carolina.
Fraser Wilkins, of Nebraska.

FROM FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6 TO FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 5

Alvin M. Bentley, of Michigan.
Donald C. Bergus, of Indiana.
W. Wendell Blancké, of Pennsylvania.
Thomas D. Bowie, of Minnesota.
Howard Brandon, of Georgia.
Herbert D. Brewster, of Minnesota.
William C. Burdett, Jr., of Georgia.
George Carnahan, of New York.
David P. Coffin, of Massachusetts.
A. John Cope, Jr., of Utah.
Robert F. Corrigan, of Ohio.
Forrest N. Daggett, of California.
Robert J. Dorr, of California.
Donald A. Dumont, of New York.
John F. Fitzgerald, of Pennsylvania.
William J. Ford, of New Hampshire.
Douglas N. Forman, Jr., of Ohio.
David L. Gamon, of California.
Michael R. Gannett, of New York.
William C. George, of the District of Columbia.
Charles C. Gidney, Jr., of Texas.
Thomas A. Goldman, of the District of Columbia.
Marshall Green, of Massachusetts.
Joseph N. Greene, Jr., of Massachusetts.
J. Brock Havron, of Tennessee.
Douglas Henderson, of Massachusetts.
J. William Henry, of Arizona.
Charles E. Hulick, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Armistead M. Lee, of Virginia.

George T. Lister, of New York.
 Rupert A. Lloyd, of Virginia.
 Albert K. Ludy, Jr., of Arizona.
 LaRue E. Lutkins, of New York.
 James G. McCargar, of California.
 Cleveland B. McKnight, of Georgia.
 James L. O'Sullivan, of Connecticut.
 Henry L. Pitts, Jr., of New York.
 Randolph Roberts, of Virginia.
 Ralph A. Schweitzer, of California.
 Cabot Sedgwick, of Arizona.
 Richard M. Service, of California.
 Robert M. Sheehan, of the District of Columbia.

Harold Sims, of Tennessee.
 J. Ramon Solana, of North Carolina.
 Herbert D. Spivack, of New York.
 Norman C. Stines, Jr., of California.
 Weldon Litsey, of Wyoming.
 Richard E. Usher, of Wisconsin.
 Sheldon B. Vance, of Minnesota.
 Edward L. Waggoner, of Ohio.
 Harvey R. Wellman, of New York.
 George M. Widney, of Alabama.
 William A. Wieland, of New York.
 Charles H. Derry, of Georgia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consular general of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for promotions in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SURGEON (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Kenneth W. Chapman

SANITARY ENGINEER TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEER (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Elmer J. Herringer

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 29 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Drake Watson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri.

Benjamin Scott Whaley to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, ruler of the destinies of men and nations, Thou hast encompassed us with Thy mercies and crowned us with every blessing. Breathe upon us Thy holy presence that our lives may be worthy of the Lord and perfectly pleasing to Him, and that our labors may be in accordance with His word and His ordinance. Lead and direct us that the issues of our country may be the object of deep reflection and wise comprehension of our responsibilities.

Do Thou dispel all confusion induced by indifference and prejudice, and bless us with the freedom of the open mind and the responsive heart. When we seek Thy peace to cleanse us and heal us, it is not only a gift but a choice and an index to better strength and achievement. This day may the words of our

mouths and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in the United States in 1947.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TABER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3245) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 323), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CANNON reserved all points of order on the bill.

DISPENSING WITH CALL OF COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the committees in order on tomorrow, Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include editorials and other material.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the minority views filed on H. R. 2616.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial appearing in a New Jersey newspaper.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech on displaced persons.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include quotations from outside groups studying the operations of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs.

Mr. McGARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the president of the Lost Battalion.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the remarks I may make in the Committee of the Whole today I be permitted to include certain quotations from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and from the record of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GARY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 43]

Barden	Eberharter	Mitchell
Beall	Folger	Morton
Bell	Fuller	Nordan
Bland	Gallagher	Norton
Bolton	Gathings	Patman
Boykin	Gerlach	Ploeser
Buchanan	Gifford	Plumley
Buckley	Hart	Fowell
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Schwabe, Mo.
Carson	Heffernan	Shafer
Celler	Kersten, Wis.	Short
Clements	Landis	Stanley
D'Alesandro	McMahon	Vail
Dawson, Ill.	McMillan, S. C.	Vinson
Dingell	MacKinnon	Vursell
Drewry	Mansfield, Tex.	West

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 377 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. Arthur Goldschmidt.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made with reference to H. R. 156, pending before the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include data he secured from the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of former prisoners of war.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address he recently delivered.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the New York Times magazine.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

RENT CONTROL BILL

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 200, Rept. No. 324) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill H. R. 3203, relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THIS WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that I may make a brief statement regarding the program for the rest of the week. First of all, in respect to the measure now pending before the House, it has been under debate and consideration for a considerable period of time. We had hoped that it could be concluded by this

evening. I still express that hope, not that there is any desire or intention to foreclose debate, because it is a most important matter, but if it can be concluded it will materially assist us in carrying on with the program for the rest of the week and for next week.

We have scheduled for tomorrow the bill H. R. 3203, the rent-control bill. The rule on that measure has just been filed. It provides for 4 hours of general debate. Whether or not we can conclude that tomorrow I do not know, but by coming in at 10 o'clock certainly we can make very considerable progress toward its completion.

On Thursday, as we all know, we are to meet in joint session to hear the President of Mexico. In addition, we hope to dispose of the bill H. R. 2780, the temporary housing bill.

On Friday we want to dispose of the deficiency appropriation bill.

It is expected that the conference report on the portal-to-portal pay bill will be concluded this afternoon, and of course we want to dispose of that this week if we can.

Next week it is probable that there will be an appropriation bill of considerable importance, and also the Greek-Turkish loan and some other matters that will be pushing for consideration.

As I said, I have made this announcement so that the Members may know what the program is and that we may all cooperate in attempting to carry it forward as expeditiously as possible.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

APRIL 29, 1947.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of the act approved May 17, 1928 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1052a), relative to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, I have designated the following members of the Armed Services Committee to serve on the Board of Visitors for the Eightieth Congress: Hon. LESLIE C. ARENDS, Hon. HARRY L. TOWE, Hon. LEON H. GAVIN, Hon. WALTER NOBLE, Hon. LANSDALE G. SASSER, Hon. ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Hon. ARTHUR WINSTEAD.

Respectfully yours,

W. G. ANDREWS,
Chairman.

RELIEF ASSISTANCE TO PEOPLE OF COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 153, providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 153, with Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday there was pending

an amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] and a substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VOYTS]. Debate on the so-called Jonkman amendment and all amendments thereto had been fixed at 30 minutes. Of that 30 minutes, 20 minutes remain. The time was allotted to the gentlemen who had asked to be recognized, and the Chair will recognize them in the order in which their names were recorded by the Clerk.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that we can improve the bill before the House by adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN]. That will give us an opportunity to save \$150,000,000. There are other amendments which in my judgment should be adopted and which will be offered as the bill is read for amendment to try to control the disposition of our relief in various countries. I am of the opinion that we have here a great opportunity to bring a little more sanity into the disposition of relief paid for by the people's money. I think if the House asserts itself and takes the action which it should, it might have some influence on what the House decides to do on the bill which will follow for \$400,000,000 which is known as the Greek-Turkish loan bill.

It seems to me, as I stated on the floor the other day, that the time has come when we must be more realistic about our approach to the problems of relief with respect to how they affect the American people.

We must stop voting blank checks against the finances and resources of our Nation. We must give greater consideration to the ability of our people to bear such large financial burdens.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] for 2 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, yesterday a statement was made on the floor that our Nation was continuing to ship to Soviet Russia trucks and heavy equipment. During the afternoon I propounded a question to members of the Foreign Affairs Committee with the idea of ascertaining whether or not that was true, and if it was true, just why. I did not receive a very satisfactory answer. That explains my taking the floor at this time, in the hope that some member of the Foreign Affairs Committee may explain to the House and to the country if the charges made yesterday are true, and if we are, in fact, shipping heavy equipment to Russia. I, for one, would like to know just why we are continuing to fortify communism in Soviet Russia when our foreign policy seems to be to check communism in Turkey and Greece and other parts of the world. There may be a satisfactory explanation. If there is, I think the country and the Congress is entitled to have it.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. The fact is that inquiry reveals this morning that that is not occurring. As to the reasons why

it was stopped, in the short 2 minutes, time would not be available to explain it. But suffice it to say that is not occurring at the moment.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman give an explanation at sometime during the day?

Mr. JARMAN. When opportunity presents itself, if someone else does not, I will.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman. I think the gentleman will agree that if that is being done we are following a rather inconsistent policy in fortifying communism, on the one hand, and trying to stop it, on the other.

Mr. JARMAN. And you are certainly entitled to an explanation, which can be made, but not in just a minute.

Mr. COOLEY. I hope the gentleman or some other member of the Foreign Affairs Committee will make that explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN], for 2 minutes.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself to the substitute offered by my esteemed colleague from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. If I understand the gentleman's substitute amendment correctly, it "strikes out the Jonkman amendment." He said without those words his substitute would be meaningless. I quite agree with the gentleman. That is all his substitute does. It simply strikes out the Jonkman amendment. What does the gentleman propose to do? He says, "Give the full authorization for the \$350,000,000, then ask the Appropriations Committee to make the full appropriation of the \$350,000,000, but do not let them spend any more than JONKMAN says, \$200,000,000, until some new committee authorizes the other \$150,000,000."

Just how is that going to be accomplished? How does the gentleman expect the Appropriations Committee to give the full \$350,000,000 under those conditions?

Now, the facts are clear. I say it is for the House to act on this authorization. I told you yesterday there was no dispute about the facts. The United Nations recommends relief for the balance of 1947. Herbert Hoover recommends relief for the balance of 1947. President Truman recommends relief for the balance of 1947. Mr. Acheson recommends relief for the balance of 1947, and says no relief will be needed in 1948, except possibly—not probably—but possibly a limited amount for Austria. Mr. Clayton says the same thing. Mr. Tyler Wood says the same thing—no relief will be needed in 1948. Then, why should we appropriate for 1948?

I have shown you by the testimony of Mr. Clayton that they propose \$250,000,000 of the \$350,000,000 for 1948. Mr. Tyler Wood says the same thing. My amendment gives them the \$100,000,000 which the budget provided for 1947 and an additional \$100,000,000 of the 1948 budget allowance, all to be spent in 1947.

This will be ample and liberal for relief up to December 31, 1947.

The Vorys substitute should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, this is a most serious matter that we are considering at this time. I am certainly not going to bind myself at this time to say I shall not support any amendment, but it does seem to me that the bill is a very good bill as it is written. It may be that the amount should be reduced. I am not sure as to that at this time. It seems there are safeguards and checks in this bill. The President may use his discretion in the matter and then we ourselves may use our discretion. I feel certain that the President of the United States and those whom he duly constitutes under this bill are not going to do anything to further communism. I know I would not want to do anything to further communism; but, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest something I believe would be a good thing to do? It is to ask ourselves this solemn question: What would the Master of us all do if He had the authority to take this money and feed people? Would He ask if a man were a Communist? Would He even ask if he were a criminal? As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, if able to do so I would give food to a criminal, to anyone who needed food.

I believe we will go a long way toward furthering democracy if we follow the humanitarian policy of feeding people who are hungry, when, of course, we are able to, regardless of who they are. I am telling you that I believe we will do an injury to ourselves by trying to confine this matter to an absurd extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, 2 minutes is too short a time. I expect to get additional time later in the day. I therefore yield my time now to someone else.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 2 minutes.

DANGERS OF COMMUNISM—SOVIET SPIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, after listening to General Marshall last night, I am more convinced than ever that we can never deal with a Communist country.

I wish to call attention to the fact that on page A1895 of the Appendix of the RECORD you will find a complete statement on the Russian spy ring in Canada, the United States, and England.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] on yesterday talked about the Committee on Foreign Affairs knowing so much more on this subject than the other Members of the House. The only committee in this House, and one of the two agencies of this Government that were on the trail of these Soviet spies last year, was the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I have no time; I am sorry.

The other day we had before us Hon. W. C. Bullitt, former Ambassador to Russia. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] asked him this question:

Mr. BONNER. What do you think Russia would do with the atomic bomb?

Mr. BULLITT. If she had it and we did not it would already have been dropped on the United States.

We need not deceive ourselves, communism is a conspiracy to overthrow this Government and every other similar government in the world, and they had their spies from one end of this country to the other, in this Capitol, if you please; and this man Gouzenko, who revolted, saw what his own country was doing to civilization. He came out and repudiated it and turned over the information to the Canadian Government. He said:

Holding forth at international conferences with voluble statements about peace and security, the Soviet Government is simultaneously preparing secretly for a Third World War.

He further said:

To meet this war, the Soviet Government is creating in democratic countries, including Canada, a fifth column in the organization of which even diplomatic representatives of the Soviet Government, take part.

How can we trust such a regime? It is time for the American Congress and the American people to awake to these dangers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to urge the House to adopt House Joint Resolution 153 as reported out by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I wish to go on record as being particularly opposed to any amendment which would make Poland ineligible for relief assistance.

Poland has been branded as a satellite of Soviet Russia, and our former Ambassador to Poland, the Honorable Arthur Bliss Lane, has made the issue of Poland clear to the American people. I have followed closely the public speeches, radio broadcasts, press interviews, and so forth, made by Ambassador Lane. It is clear to everyone who listens to what this able man says that a distinction should be made between the present Government of Poland, which is controlled by Soviet Russia and run by its agents, and the people of Poland, who have never accepted this government by any of the democratic procedures.

The intent of the amendment aiming at striking Poland off the list of countries for which relief will be provided aims directly at imposing a harsh penalty upon a people who never deserted our cause and who were saddled with a government without having been asked whether or not they like it.

It is a different thing to brand a government as a satellite of Soviet Russia and a different thing to deprive the

hungry people of Poland of the relief they well deserve.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has put into House Joint Resolution 153, as presented by our chairman the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable CHARLES A. EATON, on April 23 a set of conditions which will have to be met by the present Government of Poland before relief assistance is granted to the people of that country.

It is my considerate opinion that the conditions written into House Joint Resolution 153 are fully adequate for the full protection of our rights. The present Government of Poland will have to make sure that there will be no discrimination in the distribution of relief supplies; that there will be complete freedom of press reports on our relief activities; that full publicity will be given to the fact that the relief comes from the United States, and not from Soviet Russia; and that representatives of the United States Government will be permitted to supervise the distribution of food and clothing among the people.

The President of the United States will be authorized to cancel any further relief activities in Poland should the present Government of this country fail to meet its obligations.

In my opinion, the safeguarding clauses provided by House Joint Resolution 153—if met by the present Polish Government—will prevent it from any cheating on our relief program and for using it for the purpose of spreading communism.

Should we, however, deprive the Polish people of our aid and assistance, the puppet Government of Poland will once more have to turn to Russia in order to obtain at least some quantities of food for their population, and this will provide the Government of Poland with means of influencing the people of Poland, of alienating them from our ideology, and of directing the good will to Soviet Russia rather than to the United States.

I know how the people of Poland feel toward the United States. I know that they will never become our enemies, as their Government wants them to be. But why help the Communists turn these people against us, and why penalize them for their present situation, for which they are not in the least responsible?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this bill does not propose to send gold and silver to Europe, but rather to send fuel, food, clothing, medicine, and items to aid in food production. Before fixing the amount to be sent, let us look at what we have to give. We have given away our natural resources with lavish hand. The time has come to think some of America and our own future. Some time ago I asked the reference department of the Library of Congress to give me facts as to how many years our supplies will last of such natural resources as iron, iron ore, coal, copper, and so forth, what the annual rate of depletion is, and the annual loss of topsoil by cultivation and erosion. We have given our goods away just as if there were no bottom to the barrel, and as though our natural re-

sources were as unlimited as eternity itself. But this is not the case. On the contrary, the time is fast approaching when ours will be a have-not nation, in respect to some of the most vital and essential natural resources, and will have a shortage of others. This report from the Library of Congress states, for instance, that at the rate of use in the year 1944 our supply of high-grade iron ore will be exhausted in approximately 49 years, and that the rate of depletion is 2 percent per annum, which is greater than it was 10 years ago; that at the rate of use in 1946 our proved reserve of crude petroleum oil, unless new fields are discovered, will be exhausted in 12½ years. If new fields are discovered, they will, of course, add to our proved oil reserve. But the rate of discovery of new fields is decreasing, and, of course, discovery of new fields will cease entirely some time.

The reports of high-grade commercial iron ore is that at the rate of depletion and consumption as of 1944, our known supply will be entirely consumed in 49 years. The rate of depletion is increasing today. These figures do not include submarginal fields.

On copper, as of 1946, the rate of consumption or depletion is 2.7 percent per annum, and at that rate, the known supply as of 1946 would last only 37.2 years. These figures do not include submarginal supplies.

Because of erosion, approximately half a million acres of cultivated land are going out of production each year.

I cannot, of course, in 2 minutes, go into a detailed discussion of this very important report. I expect to insert the entire report in the RECORD within the next few days, but these facts need to be considered in connection with this bill to give away \$350,000,000 worth of our products. So far as our generosity is concerned, the green light is changing to red. Not only for the benefit of generations far into the future—not only for the benefit of our own sons and daughters, but for the benefit of our own generation, you and me, we must begin to conserve our resources.

I believe this bill should be cut from \$350,000,000 to \$200,000,000. I further believe that this bill should name not only the commission to distribute the relief materials, but should also name the terms and conditions of distribution, and these terms and conditions should be such as to encourage these European nations to take over the task of feeding, clothing, and caring for themselves at the earliest possible moment and to cease looking to us for their upkeep.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] for 5 minutes.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly to be in opposition to the two distinguished members of my committee, but I am constrained to oppose and vote against the Jonkman amendment and the Vorys substitute therefor, and I do this as a matter of arithmetic largely. We have about 35,000,000 people who are in starvation, disease, and despair. We have \$350,000,000 suggested in this legislation for their relief. That is \$10 apiece. The Jonkman amendment

cuts it down to \$6. We might just as well do nothing. That is my reason for voting against the amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Reference has been made here today to General Marshall's report last night on the Moscow Conference. I am sure all of us are grateful to him and proud of the way in which he conducted our affairs there, his patient courtesy coupled with firm adherence to principles, his refusal to yield to the pressures that have wrecked so many previous conferences. Today there are millions of people in Europe who love freedom and hate communism worse than anybody here possibly can. Our behavior at Moscow gave them their first ray of hope in months. What will happen to their new-born hope if they find that the very first action taken by the American Congress after the Moscow Conference is to cut drastically the \$350,000,000 proposed to help keep these millions alive while they struggle to overthrow the tyrannies under which they suffer? The money is authorized—it will be appropriated and spent only when need is demonstrated as it comes along. Will it not, in the gentleman's judgment, be disastrous to their hopes and ours and an undermining of General Marshall's work to take this action today?

Mr. EATON. It would be. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I have a brief statement here settling the confusion over the dates 1947 and 1948 which I would like to send to the desk and, if time permits, have the Clerk read. I do this for the enlightenment and benefit of all of us.

The Clerk read as follows:

In connection with the question of whether \$350,000,000 is needed for relief in 1947, the following information should be considered.

The report of the United Nations Technical Committee on Post-UNRRA Relief Needs found a total relief need of \$583,000,000 for European countries in the calendar year 1947, exclusive of remaining UNRRA shipments. This figure did not cover any possible needs of China. The Department of State estimated the needs for Europe plus China at a total of \$610,000,000. This estimate is also for the calendar year 1947 exclusive of remaining UNRRA shipments. (See Mr. Clayton's statement of page 2 of the committee hearings under the heading "Relief needs in 1947.")

The President requested \$350,000,000 as the United States contribution to help meet the above needs. The President in his message of February 24, requesting the appropriation, said, "The authorization recommended is designed for the urgent relief needs for the balance of the year. The most critical period will be in the spring and summer months, when UNRRA shipments will cease and the harvests are not yet available." He must have been referring to the calendar year rather than the fiscal year, since it is clear that he did not intend to spend \$350,000,000 before June 30, 1947, which is the end of the fiscal year.

The budget indicated an estimated expenditure of \$100,000,000 in the fiscal year 1947, that is, prior to June 30, 1947, and \$250,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948. This was to cover the program of shipments from the period July 1 to the 31st of December 1947,

plus small possible slip-overs in the first month or two of the calendar year 1948. This is clear from the letter of the Acting Secretary of State. He said, "The amount requested is to assist in meeting the estimated relief needs for the calendar year 1947. In the actual operation of the program some shipments may slip over into the first few months of 1948. With the possible exception of Austria we do not anticipate that further relief will be necessary unless disastrous crop failures or other unforeseen events occur."

Dr. Fitzgerald, Secretary-General of the International Emergency Food Council and food adviser to former President Hoover, agreed that a total of \$296,000,000 would be needed from the United States in the calendar year 1947 for food alone for the European countries excluding seeds, fertilizer, medical supplies and the other items in the bill and excluding any possible needs of China. (See bottom of p. 108 of the committee hearings.)

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, do I correctly understand the parliamentary situation to be that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] has an amendment pending before the Committee by which he would reduce the appropriation to the extent of \$150,000,000 to \$200,000,000, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has a substitute amendment pending whereby he would authorize the full \$350,000,000 but delegate the authority to the Administrator to take a look at it later on and see whether we shall spend the \$150,000,000?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Vorys amendment and the Jonkman amendment be again reported so that we may all be familiar with them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendments as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONKMAN: On page 1, line 4, after "not to exceed", strike out "\$350,000,000" and insert "\$200,000,000."

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS as a substitute for the Jonkman amendment: Strike out the Jonkman amendment and at the end of section 1 add the following: "there is hereby established a Joint Committee on International Relief consisting of five Members of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore and five Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker.

"It shall be the duty of the joint committee to study relief needs in foreign countries and the ability of the United States to furnish relief; the President shall keep the joint committee advised of foreign relief needs and the measures he is taking to relieve such needs and all expenditures in excess of \$200,000,000 from the appropriations herein authorized shall have the approval of the joint committee. Such approval may be given in detail or in gross amounts as the joint committee shall deem advisable."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VORYS) there were—ayes 29, noes 132.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONKMAN) there were—ayes 130, noes 117.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. EATON and Mr. JONKMAN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 156, noes 138.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Page 1, at the end of section 1, add the following:

"Appropriations authorized by this joint resolution shall be available for relief in Austria, Greece, Italy, Poland, Hungary, and China: *Provided*, That the President if he shall determine that emergency needs exist in any other countries, is authorized to utilize not more than \$15,000,000 for the purpose of providing relief in such other country or countries."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to designate the countries where the money shall be spent; and in addition it provides further that \$15,000,000 shall be used in those areas where the State Department determines aid is necessary.

If this Congress wants to get away from the idea of writing blank checks then the Members of this House should support this amendment because it is a mandate to the Department that it shall spend the money in these countries named except with the \$15,000,000.

I know the argument will be advanced that Poland and Hungary are Communist-dominated. It seems to me in the light of the heroic struggle that the Polish people have made down through the centuries that we can afford to take a chance to see that these people are given the opportunity to benefit under this legislation. Poland, in all of its history, has never yielded to those who have overrun it. I believe that the spirit of freedom is more intense in Poland than it is in our own country. We are taking a chance; but it seems to me it puts it right up to the administrators. A contract will be made with the existing Polish Government for the handling of this relief. If the State Department is satisfied that the great bulk of the Polish people will not benefit, then by all means it should not enter into such an agreement; but it is an administrative matter. We cannot this afternoon afford to have word get back to these gallant Polish people that we have failed to recognize their need even though they are overrun by the Communists.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. May I ask the gentleman whether or not his amendment will in

any way interfere with those provisions that are in the bill as proposed which require free access to the press and radio in those countries and even though free access is denied would the effect of the gentleman's amendment be to compel the furnishing of relief?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. No; in my opinion, no.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is the House to understand that as the bill stands now, Poland would be excepted from the benefits of this legislation? I do not so understand.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. No; that is not the case.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is the \$15,000,000 a part of the \$200,000,000?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes; that is right.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it specifically says that relief shall be given to these countries but no mention is made as to what amount shall be given to each one of the countries mentioned by the gentleman?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman puts that in there to be sure that the thought expressed in the report is put in the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is it exactly.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. I am thoroughly in accord with what the gentleman has said and I believe the committee should accept the amendment.

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CHADWICK. Will the gentleman advise us why Czechoslovakia is not included in the list of governments named? I think I know the reason and I believe it reflects credit on Czechoslovakia rather than otherwise but, in my opinion, it would be desirable to have the statement in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It is my understanding that there is not the need that is contemplated by this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESSE of Indiana. I wonder what good purpose it can serve to delegate any part of these funds to any one of the countries named. The Administrator can do identically the same thing without the language of the gentleman's amendment by simply giving a very small token amount to any one of the countries named if he had no intention of giving it to them under the language of the bill as written.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It is purely an administrative matter. In offering the amendment I want to see that these countries who are in such great need are benefited. It is entirely possible administratively that this money might be spread over any number of additional countries and we might, as a matter of fact, spend some of it in the Ukraine.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman state categorically and emphatically whether or not in his opinion the language which is in the bill before the House will permit part of the \$200,000,000, as it now stands, to be used for Poland, Austria, and these other countries?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes, indeed; and it will go further than that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me say that I am opposed to the bill and I will vote against the bill if it does that very thing.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Answering the gentleman's question, may I say that in the bill itself there is no specific mention of any amount to any particular country. There is nothing in the bill to that effect and I think that answers the gentleman. The total amount authorized under this bill can be distributed any place in any of these countries that the organization or the Administrator feels so disposed to spend it in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. May I ask the distinguished gentleman, who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, if under the bill, as written, and the State Department so decided, it could allocate money out of this \$200,000,000 for the relief of Russia or any other country?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It could; yes, indeed.

Mr. KEEFE. If the amendment of the gentleman is adopted, as I understand it,

he is pinning it down so that no part of this money can be used for that purpose?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Exactly so. That is the import of the amendment.

Mr. JUDD. It is a restrictive amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESSE of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESSE of Indiana. By designating the countries in which the money is to be spent, may I ask does that obligate the State Department to spend the money in all those countries or could the State Department just select two of them?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes. It is an administrative matter. They are under the legislation presumed to make a contract with these countries that are to get relief.

Mr. HARNESSE of Indiana. There is nothing in the amendment and there is nothing in the bill thus far that would protect the people of America and our Government against these funds falling into the hands of those people that we are opposing today, the Communists, who dominate the governments of many of the countries.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Well, I think we can do it. I think this amendment takes care of it.

Mr. HARNESSE of Indiana. How does this amendment take care of or protect us against these funds getting into the hands of the Communists and their friends?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. We certainly should assume that the State Department is not going to make that kind of an agreement.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Do not the provisions in sections 3, 4, and 5 of the bill make it impossible that it could fall into the Communist hands and could be used by Communists alone? There are restrictions in the bill to take care of that, and the gentleman's amendment prevents any of these funds from going to Yugoslavia and to Russia; is that not true?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right, as I understand it.

Mr. VORYS. Is this not also true, that the gentleman's amendment contains this language: "This provision shall not imply any obligations to give relief to any of the countries mentioned," so that it does not create any obligation to any country?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. As I understand the language of the gentleman's amendment it, in a sense, allocates this money to Austria, Hungary, China, Poland, Italy, and Greece, so that it cuts out Russia and it cuts out Yugoslavia.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. It goes to free people, the people who desire to be free in Austria, Hungary, Greece, Poland, and China, that we are undertaking to help.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. KNUTSON. Not Poland.

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes; Poland is in there.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. We are taking a chance on Poland and Hungary, and I hope that it will work out administratively.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. COLMER, for the Smith of Wisconsin amendment: On page 1, after line 8, add a new sentence as follows:

"Provided, That none of the funds authorized to be appropriated herein shall be expended in or used for such relief assistance in those countries whose governments are dominated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I confess that I offered this amendment only after long, conscientious and thoughtful deliberation. But we might just as well recognize that we have reached the crossroads in our foreign policy. We had just as well recognize now as later that we are embarking upon the most important change in our foreign policy in the history of this country.

We have started out to do what? Fight communism. Now, let us not get away from the objective. We are going to oppose communism. If we are going to oppose communism, then we must oppose it on all fronts. We must be coldly realistic in the approach to this problem. We say that we are going to furnish \$400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey to combat communism—and we are doing that openly; we had just as well be frank about it. We are going to furnish the Greeks and Turks \$400,000,000 to be used by them, and as an incentive to them to keep communism from taking over their governments. But how are we going to do that on one hand and then turn around on the other and say that we are going to be the big brother and we are going to help everybody? We have to be coldly realistic. God knows I have sympathy with the starving people who are under the domination of the Soviet Republic. I have been over there; I saw them suffering. Of course they are suffering over there, all throughout Europe. But the point that I am trying to drive home here to you today is that if you are going to fight communism you have to fight it with its own weapons. You have to be coldly realistic, I repeat.

If we are going to say to the people of Greece and Turkey, "We are going to give you \$400,000,000 to stop the inroads and the encroachment of communism here," and then we are going to say to those poor, oppressed people in the countries that are under the domination of Russia, "We are going to help you, too," what incentive is there going to be for them to try to get out from under the heel of oppression?

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended for 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my distinguished colleague on the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman tell us who is to make the decision as to what country is a Communist-dominated country?

Mr. COLMER. I am sure the gentleman knows the answer to that question: The same sources would make that determination as would make it under his amendment, that is, it would be up to the administration to make that decision.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my distinguished friend, who always speaks for the Polish people and speaks with reason.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman's amendment actually proposes that the Polish people shall be given starvation, and thereby we are going to win them from communism. That is the gentleman's logic and his reasoning, as I get it. I cannot understand that reasoning and logic that he is proposing here today. Certainly those people do not want communism any more than the gentleman does. They have had a government put upon them that they did not want. But the gentleman says to those people, "You must have a revolution first in your country before we will give you any aid." Is not that his logic? How are those people going to have a revolution in the condition they are in now, when they are starved and sick and hungry? A man cannot fight communism, cannot fight Russia, in the position he is in in Poland today. But they have fought communism as no other nation has throughout the years. They fought for liberty throughout the centuries, and they have always won. They will fight again. But make them strong, give them physical strength to fight. You cannot expect dead Poles to fight communism.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman has asked me a number of questions all wrapped up in one. I said in the beginning, and I have great sympathy for the gentleman's viewpoint, that we have to be coldly realistic in this thing. We have to face this issue as it is, not as we would like to have it. Yes, I have sympathy with those people, but I repeat that if you are going to treat all peoples alike there is going to be no incentive for them either to stay out

from under the heel of oppression or for those who are already under the heel of oppression to get out.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. In answer to the question asked by the gentleman on the other side, I believe the gentleman said that the way you determine whether these countries are under Soviet domination can be done by the administration. Has the gentleman thought of the fact that we recognize these countries and that their ambassadors are here? Can you see the position that we would be in if we say, "We are not going to recognize you on this thing because we claim that you are under Soviet domination?" How are you going to get around the fact that they are recognized diplomatically?

Mr. COLMER. Somebody along the line must determine this. Do not forget that somewhere down the line there is a limit to the point to which this country can go to feed the world. If we are going to fight communism, we must fight it. As I said in the beginning, I do not like this sort of thing, either.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say in reply to the gentleman from New York that these countries had their ambassadors here while they had a spy ring working in this country, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I said in the beginning that I had given some thought and study to this matter. I do not have to apologize for that. I think most of the Members of the House know of the study that the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning made and they know its recommendations and how those recommendations are now unfolding in the light of present developments. To implement those recommendations, on March 24 I introduced a resolution that would do a number of things. Generally, it would advise the President of the United States and the Congress what should be the policy of the United States in this great crisis in the world. Among the provisions of that resolution is one that would deny economic aid and assistance to the Soviet Republic and to those countries under the domination of the Soviet Republic. We hope to have hearings on that resolution before too long. We must face this issue as it is. My amendment is consistent with that resolution and it is consistent with the Truman doctrine.

In our factories in this country today we have representatives of the Soviet Republic who are there as supervisors and as inspectors to see that the machinery that the Soviet Republic is get-

ting from this country is according to order. They have hundreds of them. How many do you think we have in the Russian factories over there? We are today making the same mistakes in our foreign policy that we did prior to Pearl Harbor when we were shipping oil, scrap iron, and all those things that were necessary to build the sinews of war to Japan.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield briefly to my friend.

Mr. CHELF. I think the mistake was just made when the House voted 150 to 138 to yank the rug out from under Secretary Marshall in refusing to give \$350,000,000 to the Truman program for aid to Europe. When we cut the sum to \$200,000,000 we seriously hurt our foreign policy and our defense against the spread of communism was badly weakened. It has cost the United States over \$250,000,000,000 and over a million casualties in flesh and blood to win the war, and now we are being niggardly in providing sufficient funds to sponsor and preserve the peace. Why spend so much to win the peace and then literally toss it away once it is in our grasp? Russia wants a hungry Europe, because an empty stomach is far more receptive to communism.

Mr. COLMER. I appreciate the views of my distinguished friend from Kentucky. His views are always worthy of consideration, but the point of the matter is that this Nation is burdened with the greatest national debt that any country has ever accrued. There is a limitation even to the resources of this great Nation. We do not know where this policy that we are embarking on is going to lead us. There is a bottom in the Nation's meal barrel as verily as there is in the individual's barrel. We cannot help everybody, and sometimes I doubt whether in the final analysis we get much good will that way.

But be all of that as it may, we are all interested as a Christian people in trying to help our less fortunate brethren. But what assurance can we possibly have in the light of our knowledge of the Russian system that any substantial amount of this money sent into those governments which are dominated by Russia will ever reach the objective which we have in mind, namely—the starving people of those countries? We are told that there are safeguards of inspection and publicity, and so forth, in this bill to insure that objective, but I point out to you that everyone who knows anything about the Russian system knows that these governments in the dominated countries are nothing but puppets—the creation of Russia. Is it reasonable to assume that money, foods, fertilizer or machinery turned over to those puppets of Russia would be delivered to these starving people or reach them? And bear you in mind that under the provisions of this bill that is what is proposed to be done. From my knowledge of that situation over there no one can convince me that this relief turned over to these governments cannot and will not be diverted from the channels through which they are expected to flow to these starving peoples.

Can anyone argue successfully for a moment that a carload of fertilizer, for instance, which is turned over to one of those puppet governments cannot be diverted even though we have a handful of representatives on the ground?

Mr. Chairman, I fear that the game is not worth the candle, and personally I cannot go along with that line of reasoning, especially when I know it to be a fact that Russia has already stripped many of these countries of much of the assistance which they now so badly need and which under this bill we would propose to turn over to them to be delivered to these people.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I have waited a long time for an opportunity to speak on this bill. Before I give my words I would like first to present my credentials.

I am not a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I have never made any Government junket, flying over Rome and posing as an authority on Italy, or flying over Poland and posing as an authority on Poland; but I do know something about European affairs.

To give you the meat of my background, I am not one of those that switches with the breeze. I will refer you now to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 12, 1945, when the crime of Yalta was announced to the world. It was almost treason for anyone to say anything against that crime at Yalta. I did, and I was accused of preaching treason. I refer to the RECORD. That is more than 2 years ago. It is written in the RECORD, so I am not patting myself on the back, and do not interpret it as such, please. But here we have a statement from a distinguished Member of this House, and similar statements were made in the Senate:

Mr. Speaker, no conference of the allies in this war previous to that historic meeting just completed on the Crimea has had greater significance. It was a defense destined to lay the foundation of the world of tomorrow. The results of the conference are better than the most optimistic expectations. They are better because they are based on a truly growing confidence among the Allied Governments. They breathe sincerity and strength. Each great power made concessions. They were based on the American concept of conciliation of different points of view, and not based on a single opinion.

That is the opinion that was expressed in the House. That is the opinion that was expressed in the Senate. That is the opinion expressed by radio commentators, by newspapers, by the State Department, and by the OWI.

I took the hard fight and the uphill fight. In a 1-hour speech that day I concluded my remarks by saying:

Mr. Chairman, just as these words about Munich are today the laughing stock of the world, just as the praise which was sung of Mr. Chamberlain has now become the laughing stock of the world, just so the words of praise that are being sung about the crime of Yalta will likewise become some day the laughing stock of the world.

That is more than 2 years ago. I want to tell you why I think I am qualified to talk on this subject. Since that

time I have given many speeches. They have been reprinted all over the world. Here is a copy of a speech I made in this Congress, reprinted by the Polish underground in Italy. Here is another one reprinted by the Polish underground in France. It was reprinted by the Polish underground in England, carrying my words of advice, that the day would come when we would regret the sell-out of Poland at Yalta.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. By the "Polish underground" the gentleman means the anti-Communist Polish underground?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Yes; definitely.

Then, on May 3, 1945, that is, almost 2 years ago, I gave a speech on the floor of this House, of which more than 500,000 copies were ordered and distributed throughout the country, wherein I said that the Government of the United States of America is making a mistake; that we are making the Russians so strong and communism so strong that eventually we are going to have trouble with them like we had trouble with Hitler and trouble with Japan because we made them too strong.

May 24, 1945, a speech in the RECORD, "Trouble With Tito; We Asked for It."

Two years ago I told you we were going to have trouble with Tito in Yugoslavia; that we should not give him any money or food or anything that would make him strong.

"Lithuania Under Red Fascism," in 1945 I told you what was going on in Lithuania.

I took every one of those countries, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia. In addition, Mr. Chairman, in the last 2 years I have talked in every city of any consequence in this Nation. Talked to whom? To Americans of Polish descent, of Serbian descent, of Slovakian descent, of Finnish descent, all of them who have relatives in those countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 additional minutes to tell my story.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I am not at all sure that I will object—if the debate is to be very limited on this, I shall have to object, because there are those here who desire to plead the cause of the American taxpayers and bond buyers, and we will expect some time on this subject also.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, of course, cannot give the gentleman the answer to his question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I serve notice that if necessary, I shall object to any extension of time unless the chairman of the committee assures the House that he will not move to shut off debate. We should have time to debate this question as to whether or not we are going to send funds to the agencies of Russia on the one hand to support Russia and send funds to the enemies of Russia on the other hand.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not lie within the province of the Chairman to decide. The Committee itself will decide that.

The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 additional minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. O'BRIEN. I object.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin be extended for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request that the gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed for five additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the membership for being so very generous with me.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a most tragic dilemma right now. We are confronted with the question of stopping Moscow. We want to help poor and starving people, yet we are in a dilemma whereby in attempting to help those poor and starving people we will be forced also to help communism. There is no way out of it. Let us take the unfortunate situation of Poland. The people of Poland have a government that is not the will of the Polish people. The people of Poland have a government, Mr. Chairman, that was forced upon them by the Government of the United States of America as one of the Big Three powers. The Government of Poland today was thrust upon the Polish people. The Polish people were not even consulted. The Polish people were not even invited to Yalta. The Polish Army that was fighting the enemy all over the world was not even given the consideration of once being asked for a word of advice. Three holier-than-thou men went over to Yalta and set up the Polish Government.

The leader of the Polish Government today is not even a citizen of Poland. He has been a citizen of the Soviet Union ever since 1921, and the Polish people still do not recognize that as their government. But the Government of the United States of America does recognize that as the Polish Government. So we are out to punish those people for a government which the Polish people do not want but a government which the United States of America forced upon them and a government which the Government of the United States recognizes. So that is the dilemma in which we find ourselves.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. And the ratio of nominal Communists in Poland is less than 1 to 30 anti-Communists. Is that correct in the gentleman's estimation?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Yes. If war ever breaks out between the United States and Russia, just as Poland was the first country with courage enough to stand up and fight Hitler you will find the Polish people fighting alongside the Gov-

ernment of the United States of America; you will have the Poles alongside the United States of America sooner than you will have the people of Italy. They will go like they went in all the other wars, to the side with the more opportune chance of winning the war perhaps, they will go where they can get fat like they got fat in this war, and likewise a lot of other countries I could name. You have more Communists in Italy today, real honest to God Communists who are sold on the cause of communism, than you will ever have in Poland.

I received a letter the other day from a man who left the force, the anti-Communist underground of Poland. He says he is leaving the force to join his family in Warsaw. In that letter he said to me:

We are not giving up the fight against communism, but I am tired of starving in the force; so I am going to eat and live until the opportunity arises when we can get help from the outside and when the world wakes up that communism is dangerous and the world will set itself up to destroy communism. When that time comes we will again march into the forests and we will first fight communism.

I wish I had time to show you how many Communists have been killed in Poland by these men who are fighting in the forests. That is the reason I asked for 15 additional minutes to give you the names of these men who fight communism, the torture they go through, the concentration camps they are sent to and the punishment they receive. They are fighting communism now and approximately 10 Communist agents a day are being slaughtered by the Polish underground.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman then, I take it, is definitely against the Colmer amendment?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I am against the Colmer amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended 10 minutes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 5 minutes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I never did want to impose myself upon the patience of anyone who does not care to listen to me. If I had the time I could tell you and the gentleman who objects a darn sight more about what is going on in Europe than the State Department can.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi, the author of the proposed amendment, in his statement that the United States has at last been forced to take a stand against communism, but from that point on I cannot agree with him. It is my idea, it is my conviction, that this amendment will further the cause of communism,

rather than retard that iniquitous movement.

Mr. Chairman, what nations is this amendment aimed at? Only two nations—Poland and Hungary. There is little that I can add to what has been said about the glorious history of Poland. Why should Poland be denied this relief? Why should her people be left to starve? For six centuries Poland has been in a political nut-cracker and, at one time or another, has been dominated by France, Germany or Russia; but she has always struggled for her freedom. Poland's sons fought for liberty in this country and in other sections of the world even when they could not win liberty for themselves. Remember this, Poland will yet be free again.

How about the starving people of this other little nation—Hungary? It is true that Hungary was first overrun by Hitler and is now dominated by Stalin, but the Hungarian people are a good liberty-loving people.

What steps did they take to retain their liberty and the democratic form of government while some of the other nations of Europe were bowing to Stalin? Hungary is the only nation in Europe that has voted for a democracy like ours while dominated by Russian troops. They did that when Russian troops were watching their election. They voted for the Small Land Owners Party, which is about the same as the Democratic Party or the Republican Party in this country, if you please; and they have constantly refused, under great pressure from Russia, to deviate from the democratic ideal.

Now, we refuse by this amendment to give bread and meat to the people of Hungary and to the people of Poland when we know that we are going to feed our erstwhile enemies, the people of Germany and Italy. What a travesty on justice. Why do we have to feed the Germans? For European and world stability, they say. If that is true we certainly have to feed the starving Hungarians and the Poles from the standpoint of world stability, if not for humanitarian reasons.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Mississippi and to the gentleman from Georgia that it has not been so very long since their States were dominated by an outside power, but the spirit of those people never died and they came out from under it. Why? Because they had faith in themselves. If you will show a little faith in Poland and Hungary, the only nations affected by this amendment, I believe the day will come when your action will be vindicated.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. My amendment will take care of that situation, will it not?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman knows that the Poles are dominated by a criminal dictatorship that they despise. Now,

why has not the Committee on Foreign Affairs brought in a resolution to break off relations and stop recognizing an alien regime that is lording it over the Polish people?

Mr. RICHARDS. I admit that the Poles are dominated by Russia as they have been dominated down through history on different occasions by Germany, by Russia, and by France.

Mr. RANKIN. Then why should we recognize that kind of a regime?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is water over the dam, but I should add that the question of recognition of a foreign power is not decided by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. That water is still behind the dam.

Mr. RICHARDS. I am not here talking about diplomacy and why nations are recognized by other nations. I am talking about the plight of a great people; that is what I am talking about. I believe that if we are going to feed people anywhere we should feed them in Poland and Hungary.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Colmer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the arguments as they have come on the floor of this House yesterday and today with respect to the question of the countries which are Communist-dominated, and I assume that there are Members here who feel that we are going in one direction in one place and that if we provide this relief to Poland and Hungary we will be going in another direction in another place.

Furthermore, the argument has been advanced that we must be coldly realistic, and I assume that means that we must not think of this as a matter of humanitarianism and charity but as a question of major strategy. That is the light in which I should like to discuss it.

If we vote this relief to Poland and Hungary, we are not going in the opposite direction from the direction we are traveling in Greece and Turkey. We are going in the same direction. We are going in the same direction because we know that when people are starving and destitute they are more likely to accept the Communist philosophy than if they are not.

There is a safeguard in this bill which I am afraid has not been mentioned enough, and that is on page 5, section 5 (b), which provides:

Relief assistance to the people of any country, under this joint resolution, shall, unless sooner terminated by the President, be terminated whenever such termination is directed by concurrent resolution to the two Houses of the Congress.

There is no reason why, if we find that this relief is in fact going to help the Communist governments of these countries, we cannot withdraw it. But we should not be defeatist about this and say that we are incapable of providing this relief to those who need it, to those who are starving. Therefore, it seems to me that the amendment to take the Communist-dominated countries out of the relief bill is based on a fundamental misconception and is dangerous not only

for our national security but for the maintenance of world peace.

If this amendment is adopted, no relief would go to Poland and Hungary. Since no Austrian treaty has been negotiated and since part of Austria is now under Soviet domination, I assume that that part of Austria would also be excluded.

There is also a large part of China which under this amendment would receive no relief.

With respect to Poland, the adoption of this amendment would, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'CONNOR] has indicated, constitute a sort of double betrayal. We betrayed Poland at Yalta, and we shall be compounding this crime if we now deprive her of relief.

There are several safeguards in the bill, as I have tried to indicate, which would entitle the President of the United States to terminate relief if he found that it was not going to the needy but was in fact being used for political purposes by the Communists.

I am as desirous as anyone to adopt a uniform and determined policy with respect to our foreign affairs, and I am unalterably opposed to the Communist philosophy. It has always been my settled conviction that we cannot and must not attempt to go in two directions at the same time. We must not support communism while we are attempting to oppose it. I believe, however, that we will be spreading our own gospel of freedom by bringing relief to the needy in Poland and Hungary, and this is especially true in view of the provisions in the bill which require full publicity as to the source of the relief.

Let us not, I plead with you, by hasty and ill-considered action throw millions of freedom-loving and hungry Poles into the uncharitable arms of the Communists. Let us instead give them hope, help them to revive, and indicate to them that we are prepared and determined to salvage from this troubled world the blood-soaked principles for which we fought a successful war.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and the substitute amendment close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 122, noes 23.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time is to be divided? I would like some opportunity to address myself to the substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must divide the time equally among those seeking recognition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, in view of the great number of people who suddenly desire to speak on this question, I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended to 40 minutes instead of 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT, of South Dakota, to the Colmer substitute: Strike out period at end of Colmer substitute amendment and add the following provision: "Unless the governments of the countries covered by this amendment agree to the following regulations which are hereby declared to be applicable to every country receiving aid under this act.

"The State Department shall establish and maintain out of the funds herein authorized for appropriation, a relief distribution mission for each of the countries receiving aid under this act. This relief distribution mission shall be comprised solely of American citizens who shall have been approved as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These missions shall have direct supervision and control of relief supplies in each country and when it is deemed desirable by the American authorities administering the provisions of this act these relief missions shall be empowered to retain possession of these supplies up to the city or local community where our relief supplies are actually made available to the ultimate consumers."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will give me very close attention because this is an attempt to do something for the people of Hungary and the people of Poland. It is an effort to make sure this relief bill really provides relief for needy people rather than for greedy politicians.

We are faced here with a dilemma today as to whether or not the people of Hungary and Poland will be denied relief by adoption of the Colmer amendment, thus doing it by congressional action, which I think is wrong, or whether to deny the people of Hungary and Poland relief by giving relief to the Governments of those countries which are communistically dominated so that it will still not go to the needy of those countries. My amendment provides a device and procedure whereby the Congress can make this relief available to the people of Hungary and Poland as well as other war-devastated countries, and keeps it under the control of the American Relief Commission so that it is not distributed by Communists but by Americans who have been cleared by the FBI so we know it is delivered without regard to party politics or creed.

I hope you will adopt this amendment to the Colmer substitute. It was offered in the committee and was defeated by one vote. I think it is an amendment which strengthens and tightens up the whole relief distribution set-up in all countries, because it means that America gets credit for the relief we are making available. It means we are engaging, if you please, in helping the people of Poland and Hungary and other countries behind the iron curtain to learn about

the generosity of America through actually participating in its dividends.

The big weakness of UNRRA remains in the relief bill now before you unless we adopt this amendment. That weakness was this: We failed to follow the relief any further than the central governments of the countries. This bill has the same deficiency. You know and I know if you give this relief to the central government of Warsaw or the central government of Budapest it will be distributed for political purposes—to aid and fatten and strengthen the Communists.

My amendment says that when it is deemed necessary by the American authorities which will very likely be in those countries described in the Colmer proposal, which my amendment modifies and amplifies, we are empowered to follow that relief clear down to the local community. This means it will be distributed by Americans, operating as such, recognized as such, and it will be made available to the people rather than to the political agencies of those countries. If you actually want to help the hungry people of Poland and Hungary, as I do; if you want to make this relief available without regard to politics or creed, as I do; if you want to get a dollar's worth of relief for a dollar expended, as I do, my amendment plugs up the big sinkhole that Congress left in UNRRA, which was to give the money to the central government, along with a set of instructions, and exact promises which the Communists did not keep, and then let them handle the relief distribution which big-hearted Americans financed. My proposal empowers us to follow the relief program all the way through.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman's amendment provide who shall appoint this commission?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. It shall be appointed by the authority administering this act, which, I suppose, will be the relief administrator, approved by the United States Senate, as we have an amendment from the Republican side of the Foreign Affairs Committee to create such a relief administrator.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It would also provide for the American people, who furnish the dollars, a genuine accounting, under American citizenship and leadership?

Mr. MUNDT. That is absolutely right, and it will not permit the governments of Budapest or Warsaw to claim that we are denying relief to their people. We are making it available to them on our terms, and we are pointing out that these terms will be the same as we are setting up for every other country eligible for this relief. My amendment puts an end to appeasement in relief just as the State Department and the White House are at long last recognizing that the time has come to put an end to appeasement in international negotiations and international policies with Communist countries.

Mr. Chairman, Poland and Hungary can obtain relief under the Colmer

amendment as modified and redefined by the language of my amendment. But my amendment assures that this relief will go to the God-fearing, freedom-loving, independent people of Poland and Hungary and not just those who support the Communist regimes in those countries. It makes such guaranty effective and definite, since it empowers the United States to send relief missions right up to the terminal points of relief distribution. No longer can the central Communist governments of those countries short-circuit American relief and direct it to Communists only. My amendment will stop that type of perversion of American generosity for all time to come. My amendment makes this relief bill one which will feed the defenders of freedom who are hungry with the same generosity that it feeds the apostles of communism.

It will feed hungry people, Mr. Chairman, rather than the political creeds of hatred. And it will authorize American relief missions comprised of sturdy American citizens screened by our Federal Bureau of Investigation to make the on-the-spot distribution of relief required in certain circumstances to be positive that those who receive American relief know that it is American relief and not Communist aid from Russia. It will also make certain that American relief is used to maintain life in needy areas without regard for creed, color, or nationality rather than being used as UNRRA so frequently was to maintain in power a political clique of godless Communists who have imposed themselves upon the long-suffering people of such countries as Poland and Hungary. I urge support for my amendment to the Colmer amendment and then for the Colmer amendment as rewritten by the Mundt amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] for 3 minutes.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call attention to the fact that away back in 1943 when an appropriation was being made for OWI and OSS, I stood on this floor to deny them that appropriation. I then attempted to prove to the House that OWI was dominated by Communists and they were selling Russia to Europe and to the small countries, instead of selling Uncle Sam who was producing this money. That is why we have all this trouble today. Who sold out those countries? It was our Government.

That is why if you deny relief to these little countries today that 10 or 15 years from today Russia will not be a country of 180,000,000 people, but a country of 350,000,000. Then if war comes where are we? I say we should give relief but give it in a proper way under our terms where we distribute it to the people and can tell them that it is coming from Uncle Sam, that we love them.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I hope, then, I may have the gentleman's support of my amendment, because it does exactly what the gentleman has so eloquently enunciated.

Mr. LESINSKI. If we are going to distribute food there is only one way to do it, that is it should be handled by our Army, or military officials, in cooperation with our own welfare organizations in the field, and we have plenty of them, the Jewish Welfare, the YMCA, the Salvation Army, the Catholic Relief organization. They can put people over there and distribute it in a better manner.

Mr. MUNDT. This provides for distribution by American personnel.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman understands, of course, that under the bill that is not done, but the money is turned over to the government in control.

Mr. LESINSKI. We want to turn no money over to any government; we want to feed the people ourselves. Uncle Sam will do the job right.

Mr. COLMER. But the point I am making is that the bill does not do that.

Mr. LESINSKI. Under the bill, however, you are going to deny food to any country under Communist domination. How then are you going to make this distribution of food? It just cannot be done.

Mr. COLMER. It cannot be done under the provisions of the bill, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Does the gentleman know that when Mr. Hoover appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee he commented on this very matter? He was asked this:

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Hoover, this act proposes to put funds and food into the countries through the foreign governments as channels by making contracts with them.

Mr. HOOPER. I do not want to sustain the "ins" in any government that there may be in any of these countries. I think probably putting the supplies through the channels outlined might operate to do that very thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been fixed by the committee on this debate.

Mr. FULTON. Then I offer the gentleman my time, having time myself.

The CHAIRMAN. That cannot be done in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, the shadow of Communist Russia falls across the threshold of every home, every pulpit, every schoolroom, and the pathway of every child in this world today; and for the creation of this monster who has all mankind shaking in its boots, we cannot escape at least part responsibility. The

hunger and suffering you propose to relieve are hunger and suffering which in part at least, has been brought about by Russia.

Russia is one of the two great world powers. Russia contributes nothing to relieve the distress that she has caused and there is no indication that she will do so.

We here in this bill continue the policy of appeasement which is responsible for a great many of our woes. The bill undermines the President in his determination to stop Russia through the extension of aid to Greece and Turkey and lowers public opinion in our ability to be realistic, consistent, or forthright about anything.

If the feeding and the clothing of all the world is a responsibility that rests upon us, without regard to friend or foe or for the effect upon our own people, then the bill is faultless; but if the solvency and the soundness of our Government, and if the security of our people, are our first consideration, then the bill is in part bad. The substitute offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], as amended by the Mundt amendment, I am confident it would be well for this body to adopt because, as he observed, any relief extended must be administered in a sense by the government involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, further answering the previous gentleman on the matter we were discussing, Mr. Hoover was asked whether this would be the practical method of doing it when he was before the Committee on Foreign Affairs sitting in the Old House Office Building caucus room. We discussed this very question. In fact, I asked Mr. Hoover the question to find out whether it would be possible to accomplish this distribution in a way that we would not be putting the money and the food through channels that already existed in the governments of these countries. This question was asked:

Do you suggest any other methods of distribution to those countries, through our own people, possibly, or the Red Cross, or some other agency?

Mr. Hoover answered as follows:

One must bear in mind that all of these countries have a certain amount of food supply. They are all rationing their population. Whatever the imports are, they must be assimilated into their rationing systems. It is impossible to separate the imports from the domestic supplies.

Therefore, the primary dependence still must be placed on their rationing system and the only thing that we can do by way of control is to determine what would be a sufficiency to them, and then expect the country to see that they carry out distribution honestly. It is to check such action that I suggest there should be no contractual period. If they failed to carry out the very proper conditions which we laid out, then the supplies could be stopped.

Mr. Hoover with his adequate experience on the relief of starving peoples advocates to make use of the rationing systems of the various countries.

Mr. LESINSKI. Will the various welfare organizations help to carry out this work?

Mr. FULTON. We are going to do that. We are sending over people under the State Department who are going to watch closely to see that the program in each country is carried on in a proper way and have a fair system as between public and private agencies.

Mr. LESINSKI. There are some people who have food; there are others who have none.

Mr. FULTON. We are going to send people there to watch and see that starving people actually receive it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Hoover recommends that we not make a long-term contract. He suggests we send this food to them, and leave the supervision in the hands of our own people so we can discontinue it if they violate the working arrangement.

Mr. FULTON. That is exactly right. We are going to watch it closely. We are not going to get tied up by contracts that will tie our hands.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say that my amendment provides that that continues to be provided for because it does not change that contractual arrangement at all. It simply gives the advance guard of Americans the opportunity to see that the people who need it get relief rather than the people who go along with the particular creed of a particular political government over there.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to my good friend the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman knows I was in Europe 2 years ago. I share the same apprehension as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]. If it is channeled through the Government, this food supply will come under the same domination as our UNRRA supply, and it did not reach the people for whom it was intended.

Mr. FULTON. I was afraid of that, too. May I say that Mr. Hoover stated that the method proposed by this bill is the way to do it, and that it cannot be done in a practical way otherwise. I think the furnishing of this food is the best argument that democracy can go forward. It is our best advertising and salesmanship for democracy. This bill provides food, it is not armament we are giving them.

WE FOUGHT NAZISM AND THE JAPS

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed amazed by the statement that was made by my friend and colleague the gentleman from Georgia a few minutes ago, when he stated that Russia was responsible for the want and misery that

exist in the devastated countries of Europe.

Mr. COX. I said in part responsible.

Mr. SABATH. I am glad to hear the gentleman modify his statement. However, it seems that he has forgotten that it was Germany, the Nazis, that brought about this war; that we fought nazism and the Japs, not Russia. It was Russia that actually liberated the Poles, the Czechoslovakians, and the peoples of other eastern European countries. I regret that not only he but several other gentlemen continuously exaggerate the fear of communism and charge these people who are striving for freedom and liberty, who are opposed to oppression and exploitation, and who are seeking to better their living conditions, with being Communists. It is natural and proper that people of the smaller nations who were liberated by the Russian armies should show their appreciation by a friendly attitude.

THE PEOPLE ARE FREEDOM-LOVING DEMOCRATS

Now, what I want to bring home is this: I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin, and with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] when he says that the people of Hungary are not Communists. That is true of the other small countries. The people themselves are freedom-loving democrats, very similar to ourselves in temperament, in industry, and in devotion to our own principles of freedom and equality. I know these people, and I know they are not Communists.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that I sat for a total of 28 years on the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I am the only member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the First World War now sitting in this House. I think I can say with weight that I know something about Europe.

The Poles and the Czechoslovakians have a tradition of democracy and of representative government which goes back hundreds of years, long before German greed and might wiped out their independence. They kept alive their sacred flame of freedom, and at the first opportunity successfully rebelled against the Austro-Hungarian yoke and thus helped hasten the victorious end of the First World War. It is true that in both countries drastic measures have had to be taken to bridge over the emergency of postwar recovery and reconstruction; but these countries actually have coalition governments, in most of which the Communists are a small minority, just as among the people only a very small minority are Communists.

In Czechoslovakia particularly, President Eduard Benes has succeeded in maintaining a democratic and representative government despite all obstacles, just as he maintained the integrity of the constitutional Government of Czechoslovakia in exile after the Munich betrayal and through the horror of the war years.

Naturally, these countries are not going to start a war against Russia, as some of the gentlemen here seem to think this country should do; but that

does not mean they are dominated by Russia.

WHO WAS THE ENEMY?

It seems to me that certain gentlemen in this country are more solicitous of the welfare and future of the enemy which tried to destroy civilization at the cost of 20,000,000 casualties and the expenditure of billions upon billions of dollars, who wrought destruction and suffering and misery to nearly the whole of Europe, than for those who fought side by side with us, and who themselves suffered in their own lands destruction of property and of human life and of liberty.

Even while the war was on, there were Americans who assailed and criticized the people of Russia and Yugoslavia, and many went so far as to wish that Hitler and the Nazis could defeat Russia.

Almost to the same degree as now these people attacked Russia and what they termed "the Russian satellites," all for the purpose of creating a false fear that America and our form of government are endangered by communism.

There are fair-minded people in America who are not prejudiced by the flood of twisted propaganda from radio commentators, columnists, and writers, all subservient to the reactionaries, the vested interests, the cartels, and even the hidden Nazi-Fascist forces of the United States.

SHOULD DEMONSTRATE OUR SYMPATHY

I think we should demonstrate to these people who suffered from Nazi devastation, looting, stealing, and destruction that we sympathize with them; that we are desirous of showing our friendship again by offering them much-needed aid.

There are no finer people anywhere than those you are trying to exclude from the benefits of this legislation. Time after time the offspring and the descendants of those same people, here in our own country, have demonstrated, in war and in peace, that they are devoted to democratic institutions. They have given their lives in the fullest measure of proof for their country and ours; and the devotion to freedom and democracy of the people there in Europe is no less full.

No one is more opposed than I am to nurturing the spread of communism—but this bill is to provide aid to the starving and needy people of the devastated countries.

The way to win friends for our kind of democracy is to make communism unattractive by showing the greater benefits of democratic liberties and high living standards.

RELIEF INTENDED FOR VICTIMS OF NAZI AGGRESSION

Remember that the people this bill is intended to help are the ruthless victims of Nazi oppression.

Since 1933—for 14 long years—they have been engaged in a constant struggle to maintain their independence and to establish free governments of their own.

Hitler drove the people of southeastern Europe toward the arms of Russia by a declared war of extermination which, had it not been for Allied victory, would have cost 30,000,000 lives.

I venture to say that 95 percent of the people in these devastated areas are not Communist. They are patriotic nationals of their own countries. They are trying to find a way to restore stable government and stable economy after 14 years of horror and looting and killing, against foreign aggression, and encirclement.

We have not heard a word on this floor in regard to the dangers from fascism in this country or in Europe.

The fact is that there is greater danger from Nazi-Fascist dictatorship than there is from Communist dictatorship, both here and abroad.

SAFEGUARDS AGAINST ABUSE ARE PROVIDED

Although what we provide in this bill is only 57 percent of the total amount of money needed to prevent misery and starvation in these war-torn countries, we will have full and complete control of the distribution of the supplies bought with the money.

Inspection and reports are provided.

I feel that the bill is so carefully drawn that misuse is practically impossible.

I am equally certain that every precaution will be taken by the administrators to see that no country and no people entitled to aid will receive assistance.

Remember that it has not been Russia who has threatened the independence of the Slavic people, not only during the Hitler period but for centuries back, but the Germans with their dreams of the "drang nach osten"—the drive to the east.

Pan-Germanism has threatened to engulf all Europe time after time. The Germans have always intended, and I suspect they still intend if they get the chance, to enslave all the Balkans and the Ukraine and Poland for a victorious march to the southern seas through eastern Europe.

It was the Russians who liberated the Slavic countries from the Nazi tyranny. They would be less than human if they did not feel grateful to Russia.

The United States has helped South American countries.

I hope that they are grateful for that help.

But that does not mean that we dominate the countries of South America or dictate their policies.

MARSHALL REPORT ENCOURAGING

The report to the Nation made by the Secretary of State, Gen. George C. Marshall, is encouraging and reassuring, in spite of the seeming lack of conclusiveness of the conferences, and it should be gratifying to the American people who have no desire to be plunged into a Third World War.

Both General Marshall and Premier Stalin feel that there is ample opportunity for understanding and cooperation between our country and Russia. That opinion also has been expressed by former Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles. I feel sure that if the opinion for former Secretary of State Cordell Hull could be obtained he would agree.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Colmer amendment and in opposition to the Mundt substitute. I see no particular good or harm to be gained out of the Smith amendment first proposed.

Let us not forget that this is the first full-dress foreign-policy debate in this House. The world is watching this debate. Parties and members will be weighed by people in every district in our country, and by the people of the world, as to whether they are isolationists or men who understand what is happening in the new world, by how they vote here when the yeas and nays are called on the vote that has already gone through on the \$200,000,000 proposal, and the vote that is to come on the whole bill. Let us try to lift the scales from the eyes of people who will not see. Those who are doing what they are in trying to kill this bill are playing directly into the hands of Russia. We had it demonstrated last night. General Marshall said that Premier Stalin told him that what he wants is delay—that there is no hurry about settling Europe's problems. He wants Europe, which is hungry and destitute, to get no help from America, to get no state of security and order. The U. S. S. R. for example is absolutely opposed to any action to take care of the refugees and DP's; they say, send them back to the countries they came from, even to those countries where they are sure to be persecuted for their political opinions. Why? Because no settlement—despair, discord, misery—all those things play into the hands of a communism which promise relief to such unfortunates. Communism is a religion for the desperate. If you want it, defeat this bill.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. In other words, you cannot teach a man democracy on an empty stomach.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly, and you cannot teach dead men not to be Communists.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I hope you will realize the facts about a few things that are going on abroad and amalgamate them into your thinking. In these countries that are back of the "iron curtain" there is no possibility whatsoever of any United States agency going in and finding out who is hungry and saying, "Here, my friend, here is something for you to eat." Those countries all have rationing systems, ration cards, and they are not going to permit you to go in there and find the hungry and feed them. You must do it through the local government organization. That is the first thing.

Then, of course, the second thing that comes along is the question, Who has the ration cards? Of course, many of you know, or you have heard people from abroad tell you that those ration cards that carry the greatest amount of food go to those who are subservient to the Communist way of thinking, and the

others get them if they are willing to go along. Many of them have taken out Communist cards in order to get ration cards. It is the Russian Government that is holding back on these people and not us. They use the ration card as a political weapon. If by any means whatsoever our country can devise a way so that the rationing is distributed equally in those countries, and fairly, as we see a thing as fair, then we will have done something worth while and can help in the feeding of those people who are being permitted to starve. That is basic.

The next thing is that they are obtaining from every one of those people behind the iron curtain a complete list of their relatives in the United States by name and address; and here in this country, as I am sure the gentleman from South Dakota can tell you, they are contacting those relatives and saying, "Now, your friends and relatives are with us. Will you go along with us or won't you?" It is a powerful persuader and aids in the building of the Communist fifth column in this country.

We have that sort of thing to combat. It is not such a simple matter as one might assume. In our way of thinking it is hard to understand. We must put ourselves in the same way of thinking in our own minds as they think in Europe before we can understand those things. That is the basic reason why I must oppose the amendment offered by my good friend from Mississippi. I think the gentleman from South Dakota is trying to do the right thing in his amendment, but I am sure it will be not at all effective, because of course the Russian Government would not any more allow that sort of agent to go in there and say who is going to get food in those countries than we would allow the Soviet agents to come into this country and say whether or not their sympathizers here shall obtain their help from abroad.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman's contention is correct—and it conceivably may be—then at least the Russian Government, which deprives its own people of food that we are offering to make available to them, is undermining itself.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand that the Soviet Government has a way of removing nonconformists. More than 20,000,000 of them are said to have disappeared, and many are taken every day to concentration camps worse than Buchenwald or Dachau. Behind the iron curtain it takes real courage to maintain the human right to freedom.

Mr. Chairman, no one here has denied that these peoples were sold out at Yalta. Under authority to extend my remarks, I include the following articles, the purport of which has not been denied:

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 27, 1947]

ROOSEVELT OUTTRADED BY STALIN AT YALTA—MOSCOW PUBLICATION OF FACT SHOWS UNITED STATES COMMITTED

(By Jay G. Hayden)

The late President Roosevelt's amazing secret generosity to Premier Stalin at Yalta has again been evidenced in the publication at

Moscow of the agreement of these two with Churchill dissenting, on a \$20,000,000,000 total of reparations from Germany, 50 percent of it for Russia.

Secretary of State Marshall disputed Molotov's reassertion of this claim on the ground that it had been superseded at Potsdam, and Foreign Secretary Bevin said it was of no standing anyhow because Churchill refused to sign it.

The ink scarcely had dried on the joint communiqué, following the Yalta Conference, before it became apparent that much more went on there than was immediately revealed.

The communiqué was issued on February 12, 1945, and just a week later it cropped up that the Atlantic Charter had been revised. As originally written, this document said its signers, Roosevelt and Churchill, "wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

"AGGRESSOR NATIONS"

At Yalta there was added to this sentence the words, "by the aggressor nations," the obvious purpose being to exempt territories taken forcibly by so-called "nonaggressor nations," such as Russia's conquest of the Baltic States and portions of Poland, Finland, and Rumania.

Since the Atlantic Charter was issued solely by Roosevelt and Churchill, presumably they had the right to change it in the same personal fashion, but it is doubtful if this is so of other secret agreements which were subscribed to at Yalta.

On February 27, 1945, Churchill for the first time revealed details of the agreement respecting Polish borders, including modification of the Curzon Line to give Russia the important city of Lwow, and allotment to Poland of the German province of Upper Silesia and "such other territories east of the Oder River as may be decided at the peace conference."

The latter referred to the Oder-Neisse River line, transferring to Poland territory containing 9,500,000 Germans.

In his Stuttgart speech last year Secretary Byrnes began trying to mitigate that commitment and Secretary Marshall is expected to do the same.

Yalta was little more than a month old before it leaked out successively that the Ukraine and White Russia had been recognized separately in order to give Russia three votes in the United Nations, and that Russia's insistence on an "individual veto" in that body also had been acceded to.

BIGGEST CONCESSION

Not till February 1946 did there come to light the biggest concession of all to the Soviet. This was the grant to her in exchange for a promise to enter the war against Japan "within 2 or 3 months after Germany has surrendered." To what that assurance Roosevelt and Churchill signed away to Russia Outer Mongolia, the whole Kurile chain of islands, half of the island of Sakhalin, and in Manchuria exclusive occupation of the Port Arthur naval base and a half share with China in control of the commercial port of Dalren.

China was not even consulted before this purloining of her territory, and as subsequently developed, Russia's entrance into the Japanese war, on the very last day of her commitment, bred nothing but trouble. Ever since, the United States and Britain have been trying to get the Russian Armies back home.

Not the least interesting element in all this was President Roosevelt's assumption of the right single-handed so to commit the Nation. Members of Congress have searched in vain for any provision, constitutional or otherwise, that invests the President with such broad right, except as his proposals later

may be submitted to the Senate and approved by it.

In this instance also there is the fact that Mr. Roosevelt at Yalta was reduced both physically and mentally. He died 2 months later. It is no wonder, perhaps, that he was outtraded by Stalin, but this circumstance calls all the more for some action to assure that this sort of thing shall not happen again.

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 21, 1947]

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Bit by bit the falsity and inadequacy of all measures taken during and since the war to keep the peace come to light. These are the falsity of the concept of congenitally good and bad nations, according to which nature has shown favoritism in distributing righteousness and sin; the idea that perpetual punishment is an agent of reform; the belief that the calculated destruction of energies anywhere can contribute to general prosperity; the empty hope that a common law can emerge without a common ethos; and, finally, that the structure erected and hailed at San Francisco is an instrument of collective security, and the "beginning"—as President Roosevelt put it—of a world constitution.

"Murder will out," and so will truth—no matter what is marked "top secret." The truth has been out for a long time for anyone with eyes to see. Even for the nonreligious there must have been some significance in the fact that the San Francisco Conference opened without an appeal for the blessing of God. The peace devised could bear reference to no standards, so prayer was properly omitted.

But, as the roadside posters used to proclaim in the small-town evangelical communities of my childhood: "Be sure your sins will find you out."

They will.

In Moscow it is revealed that the United States, at Yalta, agreed to reparations in the form of the forced labor of human persons—to be delivered regardless of any crimes they may have committed. They were common soldiers, drafted like other soldiers, and by an omnipotent state in which conscientious objection was a capital crime. They were protected during the war by the self-interest of those whose nationals were also prisoners and by those conventions designed somewhat to mitigate the barbarisms of war.

Then, after surrender, to the gallows with those who imported forced labor to Germany, and up with the new slaveholders.

What of you, President Roosevelt, who had sworn on your deepest political conviction and religious faith that the Allies will not enslave the German people, because the Allies do not traffic in human slavery?

Yet your signature was on that infamy. How desperately ill you must have been. Perhaps not always there, already—at moments—as the weeping Churchill reported, as though in another world.

What of you, Mr. Churchill—intrepid lover of freedom? Magnanimous, sanguine, and in some ways wise.

And what of you, Mr. Stalin? For nearly a generation invoking the solidarity of the workers of the world.

Did you think that nazism would be on trial in victory over it?

Democracy, freedom, communism were, and are, on trial.

How broken their citadels.

Now comes President Truman calling for resolute action. The United Nations is designed to make possible lasting freedom and independence for all its members, but, "we have considered how the United Nations might assist in this [the Greek] crisis. But the situation is an urgent one requiring im-

mediate action, and the United Nations and its related organizations are not in a position to extend help of the kind that is required."

The definition of a "crisis" implies "urgency."

The UN was never designed as an organization that could create a world law and a world police, through which alone the freedom of all could be maintained. The terrible gaps were in the original Dumbarton Oaks plan. Yet the State Department itself went up and down the country selling it to the American people as an infallible instrument of collective security, and to raise a doubt was almost high treason.

H. G. Wells said of the League of Nations to a lady who thought it a beginning: "You can't make an automobile out of the beginnings of a perambulator." The UN is no better.

It was never possible to enforce peace. Only law can be enforced. Without world law there can be no world police; without a world ethos there can be no law.

The United States has no authority to police the world. The UN has no authority either because it is not an instrument of law, but only an international debating society participated in by sovereign states each swayed by sacred egoism.

That is the trouble and the United States should take its stand, not in Greece nor on German reparations, but on UN reform—making it a genuine law-creating and law-enforcing agency. There we can afford a show-down, because our position will be above reproach.

As Senator TYDINGS said, "The sands in the hourglass grow less and less."

[From the Washington Post]

ROOSEVELT AT YALTA

(By Ernest Lindley)

VIOLATED AGREEMENTS CAUSE TROUBLE

It is being said more and more frequently that President Roosevelt was outtraded at the Yalta Conference. Certainly he made some very important concessions to the Russians. In view of subsequent developments, it is regrettable that certain of these concessions were made.

Roosevelt knew he was paying a high price. But he did not believe that it was too high for what he was promised in return.

First, he obtained specific Russian commitments to join the war against Japan. As it turned out, we did not need Russian aid against Japan. But in February 1945 the prevailing view was that Russian participation would shorten the war against Japan and save many American lives. This was certainly the view of the President's principal military advisers. We did not yet have atomic bombs and could not be sure that we would have them. The first great fire raids with B-29's had not yet been launched. There was, moreover, a widely held view that even if Japan proper were rather thoroughly bombed out—and perhaps even if it were conquered—the Japanese armies on the continent would continue to fight, using Manchuria, with its war industries, as a base.

Secondly, Roosevelt sought assurance that the portions of eastern Europe overrun by the Red Army in the process of defeating the Axis would be restored as independent democratic nations. He sought and obtained assurance that provisional governments in these countries would represent all democratic parties and that they would be compelled to hold free elections. The Soviet Union agreed that the handling of these matters should be a joint responsibility of the Big Three, not of the Soviet Union alone. These agreements were warmly applauded in Congress. As Roosevelt himself said, they were not all that could be desired. But they would have served adequately if the Soviet Union had lived up to them.

It is true that various ambiguities and loopholes assisted the Soviet Union in evading its commitments. But the Kremlin plainly violated not only the spirit but the letter of these pledges.

Roosevelt saw before his death that the Soviet Union was welching on its pledge concerning the reconstruction of the Polish provisional government. He was anxious and angry.

A third objective which Roosevelt sought at Yalta was to nail down Soviet participation in the United Nations. The Soviet Union had never shown much real interest in the United Nations idea. The Dumbarton Oaks Conference had left unsolved the critical question of great power voting rights. Roosevelt worked out a compromise at Yalta. It was probably as good a compromise as could be obtained. The Soviet Union has been trying to pull away from that compromise ever since. It has consistently stood for very broad interpretations of the veto right of the great powers. It brought the San Francisco Conference to a temporary impasse on this very question.

Concerning several of the concessions made by Roosevelt at Yalta, it should be noted further that he conceded no more than he was powerless to prevent. For example, the United States could not prevent the Soviet Union from moving into Manchuria and reestablishing a base at Port Arthur and control over the Manchurian railroads. It could not prevent the Soviet Union from occupying the southern half of Sakhalin Island or controlling Outer Mongolia. Neither China nor any other nation could prevent the Soviet Union from taking these steps. Roosevelt considered it better to have a definite understanding on such questions in advance rather than to wait until the Soviet Union was in physical control of these areas. The Soviet Union also apparently wanted a definite understanding not only with the United States and Britain but with China.

Taken as a whole, the main trouble with the Yalta agreements was not that Roosevelt was outraded but that the Soviet Union failed to keep some of its pledges. The United States was outcollected. Any bargain which is observed by one side but violated by the other side is bound to be lopsided in its effect.

For the failure to bring more pressure sooner on the Russians to keep their promises many things and men are to blame. But Roosevelt is not among them insofar as the Yalta pledges are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlemen from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I am willing and anxious, as in the past, to render every possible assistance I can to the troubled, confused, misled, and misplaced peoples of the earth. The law of self-preservation, however, prompts me to oppose communism with all my strength. I hope that the House will adopt the amendment which excludes communistic-dominated countries from participating in any funds we may appropriate. From the days when the Greeks, who had been unsuccessfully besieging a city for 9 years, finally captured and destroyed that city by secretly introducing within its walls their own soldiers concealed in a harmless-looking wooden horse, mankind has always been more or less aware that secret enemies within the gates are far more dangerous than open enemies without. Today and for a long time the United States has been harboring and even protecting a Trojan horse in the form of communism. Now at long last, and in the present criti-

cal condition of the world, we are becoming aware of the hostile, powerful, dangerous presence in our midst of a secret group of persons calling themselves Americans but giving paramount allegiance to a foreign power.

Communism is not dangerous as a mere political theory, or as a mere economic theory. It must stand or fall by its own effectiveness or failure in operation. We do not bar thinking in this country. People have a right to ideas, even to ideas of change. We cannot legislate against ideas, and we do not wish to do so. All we ask is that ideas be submitted to the bar of reason and public opinion. Nor is communism dangerous because its adherents constitute a political party. We believe in political parties in this country. They are essential to the mechanism of democratic government, and this is true not only of the two major political parties but of the numerous smaller political parties—the parties built around one idea, which from time to time have appeared, and not infrequently have contributed to the development of the Nation.

However, the communism with which we are faced today is not a theory or a political party, but a conspiracy. It is a highly organized, closely integrated, strongly disciplined organization, ceaselessly plotting to overthrow the Government of the United States, as part of a world-wide revolution. Under whatever camouflage of idealistic verbiage its positions are urged, it has one immediate purpose from which it never deviates, which is to support the designs of Soviet Russia.

It is surprising indeed that American citizens, enjoying the prosperity and freedom of this country, a degree of prosperity and freedom never before enjoyed by the masses of plain people in any country in the whole history of the world, can be brought to plot against the security of the country which gave them these benefits. Read the report of the Canadian Royal Commission which investigated the Soviet spy ring in Canada, and see how it is done. Scientists violated their own oaths in order to betray the secrets of atomic energy to agents of Moscow. Add to that group an array of the frustrated, the discontented, the misfits, and the victims of injustices as still remain in our democracy, and then let these all be manipulated by the shrewd, unprincipled, highly trained leadership of masters of intrigue, themselves financed and directed by an international organization, and there you have a picture of communism as we have to deal with it within the borders of this country.

The communistic conspiracy has a highly developed technique, elaborated by international experts, who have spent decades in studying how to create mass discontent and disorder, and how to use the confusion thus created to further their own purposes. The methods are well known, and have been considerably publicized, yet they are not always easy to recognize on the spot when they are in operation.

The first objective is to infiltrate into the armed forces, create bad morale and propagandize soldiers and sailors so that

they will aid or at least not hinder an actual taking over of the country by physical force. It was in this way that the original Communist success was gained in the Russian revolution of 1918. We have been very fortunate in this respect in this country. Before the war, efforts to win our servicemen did not get much response, and official quarters were on their guard. During the war there was not much danger because we were fighting on the same side as Russia. The situation is different now.

The next great area in which Communists plan first to infiltrate and then to dominate, is organized labor. Organized labor, where captured, provides them with a source of funds, a propaganda outlet, a means for stirring discontent, and if necessary, a weapon of sabotage. "Controlled unions," as a recent writer points out, "contribute heavily to the various party fronts and causes. They in turn serve as fronts for diverse propaganda schemes. They can picket consulates and Government offices with practiced skill. When conditions warrant, strikes can be provoked so as to create the atmosphere of unrest in which communism thrives. And, finally, if communistic policy so dictates, they can actually sabotage essential production. Thus the 1945 shipping strike to bring back the soldiers—American, not Russian—was an example of political sabotage, intended to weaken the United States on the international front. The method ordinarily used to gain control of a labor union is to send a few organizers to work in a plant, then join the union, then gain minor offices in the union, then start currents of discontent against the helpless officers of the union, then get themselves or certain handpicked tools, elected to the higher offices, then expel or discredit any local opposition which may exist, and eventually control the funds and adopt policies. When, as sometimes happens, their men by similar tactics have reached top positions in the international union, they can both rule and perpetuate their own power.

Communists never neglect the intellectual front. By such measures as were revealed in Canada, they penetrate academic circles, as well as dramatic, musical, artistic, and literary groups. They publish vast amounts of literature, skillfully adapted to different classes of readers. Some of it is frankly Communist. More is disguised to seem non-Communist.

Liberal-minded persons in all circles, and especially in government, are a particular target. Being open-minded, and proud of being so, they are ready to listen to new ideas, and not always shrewd enough to find out they are being used. Being sympathetic to the underprivileged, they sometimes prove credulous to communistic claims of idealism. Entirely innocent and loyal Americans are liable to find their names used to guarantee the respectability of organizations whose real, though covert, purpose is revolution. Every effort is made by Communists to get these sympathizers, if not their own members, into key positions in government, labor, education, military life. By and large their success has,

fortunately for us, not been commensurate with their efforts.

I am not here discussing the theoretical basis of communism. As I said before, its future as an economic and political theory will be judged by mankind on its merits. I do wish to point out, however, that it is spiritually at the furthest removed from all that has made for the best life of America. Communism is sheer materialism. Beginning from its founder, Karl Marx, it excludes spiritual considerations, except, of course, where it finds it can use them temporarily for purposes of strategy. Its interpretation of history is purely in terms of economic determination. It has no theory of human rights as against the powers of the state: witness the millions of slave laborers now in concentration camps in Russia. It renounces religion as the "opiate of the people," and for years promoted the Godless League. For years it tried unsuccessfully to rid Russia of religion altogether. Now it tolerates what it could not destroy, but atheism is still part of its basic theory, and it regards the Christian church as its worst enemy.

Communism acknowledges no moral laws where the interests of the state, as conceived by its leaders and dictators, may be involved. Lies are an instrument of policy. Communist leaders are always changing their names, hiding under aliases, and traveling about the world on forged passports. A denial by a Communist that he is a Communist means nothing. The party lists are kept smaller than they need to be so that it will not even be suspected that many of the most active agents are Communists. In any case party lists are not made public and sources of income are secret. There is little doubt that over a long period the American Communist Party was directly financed from Russia, just as its policies have always been imported from the same country.

Evidence on the latter point is crystal clear. The leaders of American communism are not elected by the members. They are chosen by and may be deposed by Moscow, as in the recent deposition of Earl Browder. The "party line" in America is not the consensus of common thinking by American Communists, it is the line laid down abroad. The party cannot even hold a convention except by the consent of the executive committee of the Communist International. When a convention is held, representatives of the International have the right to participate in meetings both of the central party and local organizations, and oppose the American leaders if the "line" of the latter "diverges from the instructions of the executive committee of the Communist International."

The Communist International was theoretically terminated by Stalin during the war, as a gesture to his western allies. There is no reason to doubt that it functions as always, directed by Moscow, its decisions reaching American Communists via Paris.

The number of American Communists is so small, with less than 100,000 enrolled, and its program so at variance with American ideas, institutions, and needs, that the whole movement might

easily be regarded as negligible so far as our domestic affairs are concerned. Indeed it has for exactly these reasons been disregarded by most Americans. But in these days of international tension with Russia we cannot disregard this fifth column in our midst. By every possible means these people are working day and night for Russia and against the United States.

It is part of Communist theory that a third world war is inevitable. No less a person than Stalin himself wrote in his chief theoretical work, "It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist interminably side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or another must conquer." While Stalin has recently been reported to have expressed himself in a more pacific vein, to foreign newspaper men, the sentiment I have just quoted was the serious expression of an earlier date used to indoctrinate his followers in the true faith of communism, representing certainly his earlier and almost equally certain his real philosophy. It is and has always been a commonplace of Communist theory.

A recent writer—James Burnham, in *Life* magazine, March 31, 1947—asserts, and everything we know confirms the truth of his assertion, that Communist policy regards the present period as a period of preparation for the third world war, and considers that it has in this period two specific tasks to perform: The first is to consolidate an effective domination of Europe and Asia. The second is to infiltrate and weaken all countries which cannot be brought under Communist control.

All you and I have to do is to lift our eyes and see these two efforts being made before us. In Europe, Russia prolongs the misery of the people with the deliberate intention of forcing them into communism. We see the tentacles of Russian power reaching out in Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Greece, Hungary, Finland, the Balkan countries, Germany, and France—some of these countries have already succumbed. We see the moves being made in Turkey, Iran, China, Korea. That is the story—or part of the story—abroad.

Here at home the other part is being played—the infiltration and weakening of the United States, so that it will not be a hindrance to Red fascism abroad and will in time be ready to drop, as other countries have already dropped, into the lap of communism.

It may be that in this era we will have to face acute conflict. The words from Stalin which I quoted a moment ago may well be put alongside those of another dictator whose power grew out of another revolution, and whose attempted conquests of Europe were stopped only at the cost of enormous bloodshed. This was Napoleon Bonaparte. After his wars were over, and he was in exile at St. Helena, he thus described the situation:

If we fought all over the continent, it was because two societies stood face to face: that which dates from 1789 and the old regime; they could not live together, and the younger devoured the other. (Quoted in Nickerson: *Can We Limit War?* p. 192.)

Again two societies stand face to face, and the younger is again trying to devour the other. Let us be aware what we face. Let us avert this disaster, if possible, by bold and courageous policies abroad, and by wise protection of our own land at home from those who seek its overthrow from within.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I need to take second place to any man in the House in consistent opposition to the Communist philosophy and the actions of the Soviet Government both in the Far East and in Europe. It is precisely because I want, in the words of my good friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], to consider the problem solely from the standpoint of the coldest realism that I beg of you not to pass his amendment. Everybody knows that at least 20 Poles are against communism for every one who is for it and by passing the Colmer amendment right here we withhold relief from up to 20 of our friends to avoid the possibility of some food per chance getting to one of our enemies.

Who is going to overthrow communism in eastern Europe—Americans? No; it must be the Poles and Hungarians and the Austrians and the other peoples who live there. How in God's name will they be able or encouraged to do it if we start out by telling them we are not even going to try to get any help to them.

If you read all of the resolution, gentlemen, you will find many and stringent safeguards are already provided to prevent misuse of relief supplies to build up the government in power rather than minister to the neediest. It is too bad that all of the debate has had to be on the amendments to the first section of the joint resolution before we have reached the provisions having to do with the safeguards and limitations. If we could have handled the Colmer substitute amendment later after we had examined the whole bill and perhaps even written in more stringent safeguards, then I do not think so many would have felt this amendment is necessary or wise. To me, it is tragic for the hungry in Communist-dominated Poland and Hungary and short-sighted for ourselves for us to serve notice on them here and now that we are not even going to make an effort to get assistance to them, stopping it if and when it proves impossible to get fair distribution. If I were a Communist organizer in Poland or Hungary I cannot think of anything that I would like more than to be able to say to the people, "Your western friends are walking out on you." Many people would inevitably feel they have little choice, as the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] well said, but to join up with the Communists and get a ration card in order to eat.

I am for the Mundt amendment. I want us to try our utmost to get our relief to those people who need it. It would make the Colmer substitute defensible. Relief would be withheld from Communist-dominated countries only if the rulers refused to let us administer

it. But if we cannot pass the Mundt amendment, let us reject the Colmer substitute too. Let us not serve notice on the victims of Russia that we condemn them to starvation. Let Russia refuse to allow them food if she wants to, but let America not do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi says that he has been in Europe, but he has not been in Poland. I think it would be good if about 30 or 40 of the Members of Congress went to Poland to see that country. Members of Congress have been all over Europe seeing the conditions there but they have not been in Poland. The gentleman from Mississippi, therefore, does not speak as an authority on Poland because he has not been there. No doubt, he probably flew over it on his way to Moscow, but he did not set foot on Polish soil. If he had, he would probably agree with what General Eisenhower told me at the reception of our former Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. General Eisenhower said, there is no country and no people who have been so thoroughly ruined and despoiled as the Polish Nation and the Polish people. The Polish orphan population in the times before the war was 30,000. That was the normal orphan population. Today, it is over a million. There are over a million orphans. Now, get this picture. The orphans have increased from 30,000 to a million. Who is taking care of them? There are Catholic orphanages and institutions and private institutions of all kinds. The Friends organization is there, as well as state organizations trying to help. Who is going to deny to these children the chance to get something to eat?

I have here an article which appeared in the New York Times of this morning. The headline says, "Church peril seen by Polish primate." Cardinal Hlond asks firm stand against heathendom.

I want all of you to read that article in this morning's New York Times. Here is Cardinal Hlond, a great representative of the Catholic church, speaking out openly in Warsaw, Poland—not here, not in Rome, but in Warsaw—telling the people to fight communism and to stand up and fight heathendom.

How are you going to help Cardinal Hlond? How are you going to help the Catholic church in Poland? By adopting the Colmer amendment and by denying a piece of bread to them and by making the people go to Russia and to Stalin for a piece of bread? Is that how you will uphold the hand of Cardinal Hlond and these others who are fighting communism in that country today? No. That is not the right way to fight this battle.

Here is an article that appeared in the Pittsburgh press this morning, and it quotes Henry J. Osinski, who was one of the five men we sent down to supervise UNRRA distribution in Poland. By the way, that UNRRA distribution in Poland was a job well done.

I hope you will all read these two articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the New York Times]

**CHURCH PERIL SEEN BY POLISH PRIMATE—
PASTORAL LETTER BY CARDINAL HLOND ASKS
FIRM STAND AGAINST "HEATHENDOM"**

(By Sydney Gruson)

WARSAW, April 28.—Auguste Cardinal Hlond called on the people of Poland this week end to oppose the "modern heathendom" that is trying to "replace the worship of the Creator with the cult of the creature and worldliness."

In a pastoral letter, read from all church pulpits on the 950th anniversary of St. Wojciech's death, the Catholic primate of Poland declared: "We must not avoid a showdown against heathendom."

This was his first public statement since his pastoral letter before the election, in which he urged the people to vote against the government bloc.

FIRM OPPOSITION INDICATED

The cardinal's careful choice of language in the new letter did not hide implications that the church would continue to oppose communism in Poland even though Communists have won control of the Government.

"There can be no truce between Christendom and impious irreligiosity," Cardinal Hlond declared. "It is the desire of providence that Poland repulse absolutely the attempt of atheists, tempting with the pretenses and nothing but pretenses of a philosophy of the future and with the beautiful idea of progress."

The cardinal described the church's position in Poland as "internally strong" and "externally unclear but calm."

Kazimierz Przeszynski, Polish Government spokesman, is in Rome negotiating with the Vatican for a new concordat. Cardinal Hlond expressed the belief that "Polish political thought will find a proper, perhaps even an original, manner for settling the relations between the church and the state."

MENACING CHAOS SEEN

"Modern heathendom takes different shapes and the nation's reactions to its operation are not uniform," the cardinal said. "It has brought about in many countries a menacing chaos."

"It has met no success in Poland, but it persistently repeats its endeavors to take the spiritual leadership of the Nation. Ungodliness would like to take root not only in the factory suburbs but also in the great rural parishes."

"The proclaimers of atheism cannot forgive the church for warning the faithful of the dangers of faithlessness."

He said the excesses in Polish life "make the reconstruction of normal conditions impossible." He noted that "Poland is not the worst in such matters," and concluded with a demand that "the nation must have its Catholic conscience returned to it."

In another approach between the Government and the church recently, the church episcopate submitted a 15-point memorial to Premier Joseph Cyrankiewicz, asking that freedom of press, speech, and conscience be made principles of the new constitution, now being written. Human liberties and human dignity should be fully guaranteed, the memorial said.

[From the Pittsburgh Press]

**HALF OF CHILDREN SUFFER TB YET ALL POLAND
RETAINS HOPE—VISITOR REPORTS NATION IS
GRATEFUL TO UNITED STATES**

Poland today is a country where half the children have tuberculosis, and 100 percent of the people have hope.

A picture of the war-torn country—and its gratitude for American help—was painted today by Henry J. Osinski, executive secretary of American Relief for Poland.

Mr. Osinski has returned from 15 months behind Poland's own iron curtain, where he directed American relief supplies.

LOOK TO UNITED STATES

He will speak tonight to the Allegheny County branch of the Polish relief group at 7:30 p. m. in Soldiers and Sailors Memorial.

The slender, Buffalo-born Mr. Osinski is silent on political affairs, mostly because he intends to return in June.

But he is strong in the conviction that the average Polish citizen looks up to the United States as the greatest country in the world, and Poland's eventual savior.

"When we would take our trucks into small Polish towns," he said, "people would run up and kiss the painted American flags on the sides."

"People who hadn't seen an American in 6 years would tell me, 'We knew you would come'."

Crowds would gather around the caravan and give endless cheers for Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and possibly a few dimly remembered movie stars.

HIS AUTO CARRIED BY PARADERS

On several occasions the cheering crowds picked up Mr. Osinski's light sedan bodily and paraded it through the streets.

"It almost ruined it," he admits.

He said that his committee, which now dispenses more than a half-million meals a day was given complete freedom to tour in Poland.

Its food and clothing were given out only under strict rules—the strictest being that each person receiving help must know it was given by the people of the United States.

NO RACE OR CREED RESTRICTIONS

No government agency was allowed to distribute anything, and goods were given to those who needed them without regard to race or creed, Mr. Osinski said.

The help already given has been great, Mr. Osinski said, but it will have to keep up for at least another year.

Crops were damaged by floods, and the country is still far from recovered. An estimated 300,000 are still living in caves and German-built bunkers in Warsaw alone.

Most pathetic to Mr. Osinski are the children. Checks have shown that about half are suffering tuberculosis and another 35 percent are in danger of tuberculosis from malnutrition.

Their greatest immediate need is food, especially milks and fats. Mr. Osinski said any donation would help.

"It is the greatest advertisement for democracy money can buy," he concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, it has been brought to my attention by a number of veterans who have their homes in trailers parked at the Washington Tourist Park that they are to be evicted. I also understand that these veterans have been living at this location for at least 2 years and many of them were compelled to invest their life savings in these trailer homes so that they could be located in this area where they could attend schools, job training, and where they could be employed while going to school at nights. Many of the wives are also employed in order to help their veteran husbands through school. These trailers have been kept neat and clean. The veterans have been and are good, respectable citizens. They have been paying the Washington Tourist Park

in the vicinity of \$2,000 per month rent for the few facilities they receive. Everything possible has been done to make their trailer camp a good, quiet, clean, respectable community. They have not in any way interfered with the transient trade of the Washington Tourist Park, but they have taken pride in the area in which they live and have tried to keep it up in a way in which the transient trade does not do, as is a well-known fact to the park authorities.

When the veterans heard that they were to be evicted they immediately started out to check the surrounding area for suitable places to park their trailers. They looked in vain because there is not a trailer park within a radius of 25 miles that could accommodate 100 trailers. The Temple Trailer Park was the only one that compared favorably with the Washington Tourist Park as to cleanliness and accommodations but it is filled and will have no vacancies for several months. The other camps were filthy and unsuitable even though they had no accommodations. The zoning of the surrounding area is such that trailers cannot park anywhere but in an authorized camp.

When the veterans started to move into the Washington Tourist Park it was with the idea that they would be allowed to stay there until such time as the war housing emergency was over and they could find suitable dwellings for themselves and families. The war emergency is not over yet and the housing shortage is still acute. Therefore I can see no reason why the Department of the Interior should not allow the veterans to remain in their present location under the same status as they have been allowed to stay there for the past 2 years until the emergency is over and the housing situation is such that these veterans can be assimilated into low-cost, livable homes. I would like to recommend, however, that the present location be improved by installing running water and drainage on all of the trailer lots instead of only a few. I have inspected this area many times and having stopped at trailer parks across the continent, I find this one very well equipped for permanent trailer parking with the exception of the above improvement.

Mr. Chairman, this is an emergency in which even the temporary housing situation for the veteran must be taken care of and I hope you will join with us in protecting the rights of these veterans so they may keep their trailers, their only homes, in the Washington Tourist Park until the housing emergency ends.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I boarded a plane in Cleveland at 6 o'clock this morning, and the only reading matter I could find on the plane was the New York Times, and I had to read it for 2 hours. There is a lot of good reading in it, including foreign news. Thirteen foreign articles appeared in the New York Times this morning—dispatches from various parts of the world. I can readily understand why there is

so much confusion on the floor of the House and why there is so much muddled thinking, not only in this country but throughout the world, when you get the substance of what those statesmen and politicians in other countries are talking about. As a matter of fact, I heard my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] tell about democracy at work in Czechoslovakia. I read an article concerning Czechoslovakia's confiscating all private industry and making it a part of the state. Well, if that is democracy, then I do not know what democracy is.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. O'KONSKI. With regard to democracy in Czechoslovakia, they recently hanged the Catholic monsignor for preaching his faith.

Mr. BENDER. While the gentleman is on his feet, will he conclude his earlier speech and say how he feels about this bill?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Well, it is hard to say what I wanted to say in half an hour, in 1 minute, but it is my opinion that we have been following a double-dealing, stupid foreign policy for the past 5 years, and this bill is merely a continuation of that same stupid, double-dealing foreign policy. By that I simply mean, if we are going to adopt a policy of fighting communism, I contend that as long as our State Department recognizes a government imposed upon the people of Poland by force and by aggression, so long is that State Department not consistent in its policy of fighting communism. There is only one way to fight communism, and that is to quit recognizing any government imposed by force that preaches the doctrine of communism. You are not going to stop communism by sending bread. I have more than a thousand communications in my office from people in those downtrodden countries, and not one of them asked for bread. They ask for freedom. They ask to be unyoked from this beast of communism that has been thrust upon them. Until we have cleaned house in our State Department, or we have a State Department that follows one consistent policy, you will never get rid of communism. They talk about stopping communism in Poland. One part of the State Department was asking the Polish Government to have a free government, but another part of our State Department, 10 days before that, unloaded \$24,000,000 of Polish assets onto the Polish Communist Government so that they would have \$24,000,000 to spread communism among the Polish people, telling them that the American Government wants the Communist Government to win.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has expired.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman has made a much better speech than I could. I am glad he completed his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, if they had a regime in Poland representing the Polish people I would be for lending them every possible aid, but everybody knows that the people of Poland are under the heels of a commissar, a Communist regime that is grinding them into the dust.

If you will turn back and read an article that came out the other day about the 14,000,000 slaves in Communist Russia, you will find this statement:

Here, for example, is a part of the testimony of one Polish prisoner who had formerly been a judge. Here is what the judge said: "Half naked, barefooted, half alive, we arrived in the icy and deserted tundra where there was but a stick with a board nailed to it bearing the words 'Camp Point No. 228.' We ate rye flour mixed with water—uncooked. At night we slept in dugouts, lying close to each other for warmth on wet branches spread out on the mud."

Then he goes on to tell of the horrible treatment these slaves receive. He said:

Many died each night in the camp, and orderlies would tear the clothes off the bodies and then drag them to the morgue, a primitive barn made of sticks and branches where piles of corpses lay.

I am for the Colmer amendment for the simple reason that in my opinion this money will go into the hands of those Communist dictators just as the money and the supplies did that went to Russia. They have distributed them and lied to the people about where they came from. Communist Russia never gave America any credit at all for the things we sent to Russia.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Does the gentleman know that 50 percent of the children of Poland have tuberculosis?

Mr. RANKIN. And they will die of starvation if we depend on the Communist regime to feed them.

Mr. SADOWSKI. They will certainly starve to death if they have to depend upon you and Mr. COLMER.

Mr. RANKIN. No; we have been more charitable than the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] by a heck of a sight.

I am opposed to any Communist regime or any Communist-dominated regime anywhere in the world.

Let the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House go into these matters and let the State Department or the administration break with this Communist dictator, this criminal that now has his heels on the neck of the people of Poland and then we can deal with the people of Poland themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think the evidence that has been presented here today will show you that we now have a bill before us which authorizes the Government of the United States to make contracts with Russia for relief, and with Russian-dominated countries for relief. Within a few days we shall have before this House a pro-

posal to send some three or four hundred million dollars of relief and armaments to Turkey and Greece in order to equip them to fight Russia.

I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin when he said that is double dealing, double talk. Unless amendments similar to the Colmer amendment are put in this bill, unless we can have United States supervision of these relief matters, food stations, clothing, whatever it may be that is sent, and unless the relief is withheld from Communist Russia and Communist-dominated countries I for one shall vote against the bill and take my chances with the good people of my district.

I do not propose to involve my taxpayers and my bond buyers in financing any such double dealing now or at a later date.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. I wish to ask the gentleman from Michigan the same question I asked the gentleman from New York yesterday: Does the gentleman feel that this measure is necessary for our common defense and for the welfare of the United States?

Mr. CRAWFORD. To finance Russia? No. To finance Russian-dominated countries? No. To put relief in the hands of Russian-dominated governments to drive the people into their camp? No. I shall not vote for any such relief at any time; and because I do not believe such is for the common defense and for the welfare of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. My amendment would prevent the giving of relief to Russia itself.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Oh, but what about the Russian-dominated countries? If we could ascertain the facts we would find millions of people behind the iron curtain in Russia who are opposed to the Communist Government now controlling and often liquidating the Russian people. My heart goes out to them, but I will not fight my enemy and feed him at the same time. I will fight him, but I will not feed him at the same time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. May I say that the gentleman speaks the sentiments I have so far as this bill is concerned.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Will the gentleman vote for relief for Germany?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly, because we are dominating Germany. We are dominating and occupying Germany and of course I would vote to feed the Germans over which we exercise such control.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman is for relief for Germany but he will not vote for relief for the Polish people.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Poland is under the Russian heel. No one knows that better than the gentleman. Why should I put money and food in the hands of the Russian group in Poland to drive the Polish people to go along with Russia and against us?

Mr. SADOWSKI. That is not the gentleman's reason.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Oh, yes. The gentleman should not try to sell me his bill of goods.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to the arguments for and against the Smith amendment, the Colmer amendments and the Mundt amendment and the general debate on this House Joint Resolution 153, to provide relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war. Among the six countries specifically named by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin we find Poland, and we find great opposition contained in the Colmer amendments to relief to that particular war-torn country because it is admittedly a Communist dominated country, in spite of elections in January.

I am constrained to remark that there is no necessity this year to adhere to the usual custom in the House of holding exercises commemorating May 3, known as Polish Constitution Day—so many friends of the Poles expressed themselves so succinctly and so unqualifiedly here on the floor of the House during these past few days and have indicated their sympathy for these freedom-loving, freedom-seeking and for freedom-dying peoples as is manifested in their history.

From my background, from letters I have received from Poland, from statements of representatives of relief organizations operating in that country, I know that there is great distress and need of care, especially for the undernourished children. General conditions make continuous care mandatory in order to survive. Insufficient food is causing great loss of life due to exhaustion by the workers, thousands upon thousands of whom are physically weakened from the years in concentration or other work camps.

Relief can be gotten to these needy in Poland without being stolen and can be safeguarded by the administrators the same as private relief organizations who are presently doing such magnificent, though far short to be fully effective, work in that country due to their own limitations of supply.

This bill is a humanitarian measure and concerns underfed, undernourished, and starving peoples of countries devastated by war. General Eisenhower said there was no greater devastation in any capital city than Warsaw. This being so, Poland should be included in the countries to which this relief will be given and for that reason I shall vote against the Colmer amendments.

AID TO POLAND

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will we give aid to the hungry peoples of

Poland? That is the question now before the Congress. I say that the Polish people are more entitled to assistance from this Nation than the peoples of any other foreign nation. It was the Polish people who first fought the Nazis—and they fought the Communists at the same time. In thus carrying the torch for freedom and democracy against the dictatorial hordes of Europe and Asia they served the freedom-loving peoples of all the world. They did so at the expense of despoiling their own land. In the aftermath that followed no nation was despoiled as Poland was despoiled and no peoples were persecuted as the Poles were persecuted. Why? Because they had the courage to fight for the same ideals of freedom that the United States has advocated for over 170 years. I plead with you to adopt no amendment that would interfere with our attempt to feed the starving remnants of a Poland whose courageous fight against dictatorship in the face of insuperable odds equaled that of the bravest nations in history.

DO NOT AID COMMUNISM

There are those who say this will aid communism—but there are adequate provisions in this bill to protect us from aiding communism. We propose to help feed those starving in Poland and we propose to tell the Polish people who is feeding them. That will not aid communism—it will fight communism for it will show the Poles that we are their friends.

POLISH PEOPLE ARE NOT COMMUNISTS

The Polish people are not Communists, they are Christians of the most devout type. They abhor communism, they detest it. We should help them as a nation get back on their feet. We should help them become a strong nation. Then as a nation they will throw off the Communist fetters that presently have some control over their government. We can today help them fight communism by voting in support of this bill to feed their hungry deserving people.

With the humanity for which we as a people are famous I am sure you will not fail to respond to the needs of our courageous allies in Poland by voting in their support. Your vote for this bill will be cast on the side of God.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a hungry stomach knows no politics. It seems to me it would be a short-sighted policy to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi denying absolutely any relief to the people of a so-called Communist-dominated country. In the first place, there is the difficulty of defining this term, but more important and fundamental than that is the humanitarian and, indeed, as I see it, intensely practical proposition that in Poland and Hungary, the two countries here chiefly concerned, the destitute and starving people whom this great Nation seeks to help, are just as hungry, just as cold, and just as sick, and just as much in need of food, clothing, and medical supplies as those in other countries whose politics do not follow the Communist line.

Ambassador Lane, recently returned from Poland, and other authorities, tell

us that not over 10 percent of the people in that devastated country want a Communist government. Ninety percent must bow to the will of this small clique because force so dictates.

In Hungary in the recent elections, only 5 percent voted for Communist candidates, 95 percent registering their courageous protest against the regime.

If we deny to these vast majorities in these two countries any relief when we are extending it to their stricken brothers in neighboring countries, it will be a demonstration to them, not of the warmth of our generosity, but of a cold and purely political approach to the problem of human suffering.

It is not necessary for me to restate my position on communism. It is well known to this body and to the people in my district, but I do say to the House that the way to fight communism is not only frontally, but also, and perhaps more important, by demonstrating to those who have embraced or are about to embrace this ideology, that there is a better idea, there is a nobler philosophy, known as democracy, which has its roots in Christianity.

It is argued that if relief is denied in these so-called Communist-dominated countries they will rise up in revolution against those in power and overthrow them. My answer to that is that it is far more likely to win adherents to the cause and principles in which we believe for these people to see the essential difference between those who would deprive them and those who would succor them. It would be, in my judgment, a tragic mistake for us to allow ourselves, because of our justifiably embittered feeling about communism, to be swept off our feet to take action which not only is violative of humanitarian principles, but is also against our own enlightened self-interest.

I am aware of the duty which we owe to those who must foot the bill for this relief. Much as my heart might dictate charity, I would feel hesitant to vote for the measure before us, were I not entirely convinced that it is essential to the pattern of our country's defense and the role of world leadership which, whether we wish it or not, is now ours. I favor every type of safeguard to insure that this food and clothing be not used, as it was so frequently in the UNRRA days, for political purposes. We must not turn it over to any of these countries to parcel out to their friends for votes.

There are many safeguards already in this bill directing relief to be stopped when it becomes apparent that such abuses exist, permitting our representatives to go into these countries and see what is happening, and allowing the press and the radio to report. I favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota which will say, in effect, that in any case where it is considered necessary, an American mission may go in to supervise in detail the distribution of these supplies. I think that is only reasonable and we should insist upon it to be sure that our objective to alleviate hunger, nakedness, sickness, and human suffering is achieved and that the taxpayers' dollars are not wast-

ed. I believe the vast majority of the American people, when these protective provisions are written into this law, will wish to share their plenty with these desperately needy in the war-devastated areas.

I favor naming the countries where this relief is to be extended, with an emergency provision for a small amount to be expended if some pestilence or sudden catastrophe should arise elsewhere. I agree with those who say we should not write a blank check.

I understand an amendment is to be offered to permit a portion of this relief fund to be turned over to the Children's Fund which was recommended by ex-President Hoover in his testimony. One who has been seen, as I have, tragically thin little children in three of these countries concerned, in the raw days of December, their little hands purple with the cold, collecting faggots or picking over an ash heap to find some half-burned clinkers from which they could extract a few flickering grains of heat, could not fail to support this permissive amendment.

It is also my understanding, that in some of these countries it is intended to sell a part of these supplies. In other words, they will not entirely be distributed to the destitute, but some of them may be sold to those who can afford to buy them. Anyone who can pay, should do so. It is, of course, a fact that in some of these countries there is such a shortage of actual goods that even those with money to pay for them simply cannot get them. If any of these supplies are sold, we should require that funds derived from such sales be held in a separate account which can only be used for relief and rehabilitation under the approval and scrutiny of United States representatives.

There is probably one place where we must draw the line on relief. The people of this country should not be required to put up money to supply food and clothing to the people of the country which is paying out reparations under treaty. My understanding is that this situation applies only to Hungary and that an amendment will be offered to meet that situation. The treaty with Hungary has not yet been ratified by the Senate. Such an amendment will not deny relief to Hungary, as I should not wish to do, provided the Senate does not ratify the treaty. On the other hand, I am informed that Hungary is scheduled to pay \$23,000,000 a year to Russia in reparations. The people of this country will not, I believe, support a decision which means that the food and supplies which we pour into a country are to be taken out at the other end by Russia. The way to meet that situation is by denial of ratification to an arrangement which imposes such a burden on a nation struggling to survive.

Under the safeguards which have been and will be written into this proposed bill by way of amendment, I shall support the measure. My heart, my conscience, indeed, as I see it, the welfare of my country would not permit me to do otherwise.

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Chairman, I desire to associate myself with the views of my colleagues the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] and the gentleman from Connecticut. It seems to me that it would be fatal strategy, at this juncture of our affairs, to confess defeat of our democratic ideas in Poland and Hungary, and abandon those grand peoples to the tender mercies of the Communist regimes imposed by Russia upon them. I believe that our concept of human freedom burns in their hearts; we must not fail them or appear to abandon them in this dark hour of their affairs.

And at the same time I want to mention here again Czechoslovakia, as I did earlier in the day, as a country excluded from our interest and support only because, by their own enterprise and devotion, they have made greater progress in the restoration of normal conditions than some of their neighbors have been able to do. I regard Czechoslovakia as the most hopeful of the central European countries now under the shadow of Soviet influence.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, this debate develops the almost insoluble problem, moral as well as economic and political, that confronts us and the world. I am afraid that we will not be able to solve it here today. I wish I were as sure as some of my brethren seem to be here today of their position. However, I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], which, I think, will obviate, in some degree, at least, the almost insoluble difficulty of distribution which confronts us.

Our whole instinct and desire in this legislation is to relieve suffering, avert death and starvation and disease of people who are innocent. How to do that and at the same time avoid subsidizing the Soviet Government, which is the incarnation of everything, in my judgment, that is evil, is a problem that I do not believe we are going to solve here today. If by adopting the Mundt amendment we will make it possible for wise and strong representatives of the American desire and purpose to go into the individual communities and deal at first hand with the people who are suffering and in need, making their actions conform with our standards, then I am for the Mundt amendment, and I think it will go a long way toward solving the problems confronting us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk reread the Mundt amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read it.

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Mundt amendment to the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to the Colmer substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Colmer substitute as amended by the Mundt amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. So that we can clear up the situation, may I inquire of the Chair if it is not true that if we should now vote down the Colmer amendment it would also vacate the amendment which we just approved so overwhelmingly?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OWENS. Is it not also true that if we vote for the Colmer amendment we have automatically put out the Smith amendment? That was the original amendment. The Colmer amendment is a substitute. If we now vote for the substitute we do not have the Smith amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. In that event we will still have to vote on the original Smith amendment as amended by the substitute.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would not be helpful to get unanimous consent to have the Clerk read the Colmer amendment as it will read now with the Mundt amendment attached thereto? I so move.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the Mundt amendment has just been read. I will not object to the Colmer amendment being reread, but I do not see any use in having any others rereported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman objecting?

Mr. RAYBURN. I object.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BENDER. Should we not have the Smith amendment read now?

The CHAIRMAN. We are not ready for that. It would not be in order at this time.

Mr. COLMER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLMER. In order to clarify the matter, is it not true that the present parliamentary situation is that the Mundt amendment to the so-called Colmer substitute has been adopted?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. COLMER. And that if the Colmer amendment is now adopted, that would leave out the Smith amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. We would have to vote on the Smith amendment as amended by the substitute.

Mr. MUNDT. I cannot believe that our former Speaker wants to decline the opportunity for the House to act intelligently on this matter. We are in a parliamentary tangle, and I wish, on reconsideration, he would permit the substitute as amended to be read to the House so that we can vote intelligently.

I ask that the former Speaker extend that courtesy to the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. I am going to extend that courtesy, but I am going to object to any more speeches being made on one side or the other of this question under the guise of a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota that the substitute amendment as amended be read?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. COLMER for the Smith of Wisconsin amendment: On page 1, after line 8, add a new sentence, as follows:

"Provided, That none of the funds authorized to be appropriated herein shall be expended in or used for such relief assistance in those countries whose governments are dominated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics unless the governments of the countries covered by this amendment agree to the following regulations which are hereby declared to be applicable to every country receiving aid under this act.

"The State Department shall establish and maintain out of the funds herein authorized for appropriation a relief-distribution mission for each of the countries receiving aid under this act. This relief-distribution mission shall be comprised solely of American citizens who shall have been approved as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These missions shall have direct supervision and control of relief supplies in each country and when it is deemed desirable by the American authorities administering the provisions of this act these relief missions shall be empowered to retain possession of these supplies up to the city or local community where our relief supplies are actually made available to the ultimate consumers."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be read at this time so that the House may have the full picture.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: On page 1, at the end of section 1, add the following:

"Appropriations authorized by this joint resolution shall be available for relief in Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and China; *Provided*, That the President, if he shall determine that emergency needs exist in any other country or countries, is authorized to utilize not more than \$15,000,000 for the purpose of providing relief in such other country or countries."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that the adoption of the Colmer amendment would automatically defeat my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That would be the effect of it.

The question is on the Colmer substitute as amended by the Mundt amendment.

The Committee divided; and there were—ayes 127, noes 104.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. EATON and Mr. COLMER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 135, noes 110.

So the substitute amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now occurs on the Smith amendment as amended by the substitute.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I understand the amendment that was just voted on, as amended by the Mundt amendment, was a substitute for the Smith amendment. Then, why do we vote on the Smith amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That was the original amendment.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I make a point of order against the request for a division. It came too late. The vote was announced. The result was announced and the decision of the Committee was announced. Therefore, the request for a division comes too late. That is my point of order.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, on that point of order I would like to be heard. There was confusion all over the Chamber. I was seeking recognition to ask for a division. The fact that it was announced prior to that has no bearing upon the point at all.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman was not recognized for that purpose. The whole thing was decided and the vote was given and there was a pause. The Chair did not recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I say further, Mr. Chairman, that the Chair paused for an appreciable period of time, after the decision of the Committee was announced by the Chairman, and no demand for a division was made.

The CHAIRMAN. The purpose of any vote is to ascertain fairly the judgment of the parliamentary body, and we have not passed on to the consideration of any other business. Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I make the point of order that the House is out of order in voting on the Smith amendment after the Colmer substitute had been agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I make the point of order that the House is out of order in voting on the Smith amendment after the Colmer substitute had been agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. RAYBURN. Permit me to say we have followed the rules of the House, even under the greatest stress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thanks the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read that on which we are now voting by division.

The CHAIRMAN. The Smith amendment as amended by the Colmer substitute.

Mr. BLOOM. The Smith amendment was read before.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair state the question that is before the Committee.

The question is on the Smith amendment as amended by the Colmer substitute.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 136, noes 72.

So the Smith amendment as amended by the Colmer substitute was agreed to.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON. As I remember it first there was a Smith amendment, then the Colmer amendment substituted, then there was an amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] which was an amendment, not a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. FULTON. Then we passed the Mundt amendment and then voted on the substitute as amended; so there was then no other amendment to be considered because as soon as the substitute as amended was agreed to there was no original amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Not under the parliamentary procedure of the House. The Smith amendment had not yet been disposed of.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: Page 1, line 8, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "Provided, That from the sums appropriated pursuant to this section the President may make contributions to the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations for the special care and feeding of children, and such contributions shall not be subject to the limitations and requirements provided in this joint resolution, but after \$15,000,000 has been so contributed, no further contributions shall be made which would cause the aggregate amount so contributed by the United States, (1) to constitute more than 57 percent of the aggregate amount contributed to said fund by all governments, including the United States; or (2) to exceed \$50,000,000, whichever is the lesser."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota that if he will change his amendment and provide for sending it through the International Red Cross I will be glad to support his amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will listen carefully to the ex-

planation of the amendment. It authorizes support by the United States to the International Children's Emergency Fund which was unanimously adopted by the first General Assembly of the United Nations meeting in New York last December. Its purpose is to provide assistance for three main groups, needy infants, undernourished children, and nursing mothers.

President Hoover in his testimony said that he particularly favored "aid to the United Nations project for the special feeding of subnormal children." Now, this fund has already been set up and if the gentleman from Mississippi will listen, I will advise him that the man already appointed to be its Director is Mr. Maurice Pate who served with Mr. Hoover in the American Red Cross after World War I. He served also as President of the Polish Relief Commission from 1939 to 1941. He has been director of the American Red Cross in charge of relief to prisoners during World War II. So we are sure that the fund will be managed by one who has been working under the Red Cross all these years and has the highest qualifications.

A unique feature of this organization is that it does not operate by giving its food to the governments of the various countries in which it works. It maintains title to its relief supplies from the time they are procured here in the United States or elsewhere until they reach the ultimate recipient. The distribution will be handled and controlled by people who have been carefully trained and who have had long experience in the work of the American Red Cross.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Then why not let the Red Cross handle it?

Mr. JUDD. Because the American Red Cross, first, is not in a position under its charter to carry on relief in areas for which our Government does not have specific responsibility as we do, for example, in Japan and western Germany. Furthermore, there are many real advantages in doing this on a cooperative basis under the United Nations, if we can do so without the abuses and bad results we had under UNRRA, which there is every reason to believe we can. We know what the administration of this children's fund is going to do. It will not be welfare work such as we had during the depression. It will be hard-headed efficient relief such as Hoover gave after World War I, and such as Red Cross experts have always given. It will bring relief to the groups in a population whose need is greatest, most urgent, most immediate.

The Members of the House are divided with respect to this whole joint resolution. Some are in favor of the resolution, but they may be against this amendment because, they say, we should have a separate bill after awhile for \$50,000,000 or some such sum for the children's fund. I hope those Members will carefully reconsider before they vote against this amendment. I am

afraid that if they do not vote today to authorize the President to make contributions from this general relief appropriation to the children's fund, a separate bill may not be taken up for weeks or even at all. Let us at least do this much now. If need for more in a separate bill is demonstrated later, this will not prevent action then.

My amendment provides that the President may, if he wishes, contribute to the emergency children's fund up to \$50,000,000 of the sum authorized in this joint resolution. It is provided further that he can make initial contributions of \$15,000,000 to get the work going right away. We have to get help to those children in the next few critical weeks. He cannot make additional contributions from the total of \$50,000,000 authorized until other nations have come through, so that the aggregate amount ultimately given by the United States will not exceed the 57 percent which has been assigned to us as our share and in no case will it exceed a total of \$50,000,000.

Those who are in favor of House Joint Resolution 153 will, I hope, vote for this, and then we will make sure that those who need it most will get help. On the other hand are those who are opposed to the whole joint resolution. You, too, should vote for this amendment, because if the joint resolution does pass, as I hope and am confident it will, you will thus make sure that such money as is given will go to the place where there is reason to believe it will have the greatest chance to do the most good. Surely, whatever else we cut down on we cannot cut down on hungry babies and children and nursing mothers.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If you want the hungry children of Europe to get this money, do not send it through the Tower of Babel, but send it through the American Red Cross and the International Red Cross, and it will feed 10 times as many children as you intend to do.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. I am in great sympathy with the gentleman's amendment, and I think something should be done. But, I would like to have the gentleman clear up this one thought: What is the difference between the \$15,000,000 that the gentleman speaks of and the sum of \$50,000,000 that he speaks of? I would like to have him explain that to the Committee so we will understand where the difference is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Let me say to the gentleman from New York, that if we were just to provide, as did the resolution I

originally offered in committee, that not more than 57 percent of the aggregate amount raised for this International Children's Fund under the United Nations should be given by the United States, we could not move until the others had moved. I believe the President of the United States should be able to make an initial contribution of up to \$15,000,000 to this fund to help get it going. Then, any additional contributions by us would be dependent upon whether others make a similar contribution.

Mr. BLOOM. When the gentleman speaks of 57 percent does he mean 57 percent of the \$610,000,000?

Mr. JUDD. No. I mean whatever special fund is raised for the children. We will give up to 57 percent, but not to exceed a total of \$50,000,000.

Mr. BLOOM. But we only obligate ourselves for \$15,000,000 first.

Mr. JUDD. Yes. We authorize \$50,000,000 if others contribute their share. But even before others contribute their share we authorize the President to contribute \$15,000,000 to this fund to help get it started quickly.

Mr. BLOOM. I think the gentleman has a very good amendment there and I am for it 100 percent.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman for his approval.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to ask the gentleman if the money which is taken from this fund that has been provided here would not be taken out of the distribution by this Commission which has just been provided for by another amendment and placed in the hands of an international organization?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; it would be. The money authorized in this amendment would be given to the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations, which is already set up. If I had time I would like to read from their resolution. It is very carefully and explicitly drawn. The executive board of the fund has representatives for a great many countries. It has laid down its policies for administration of relief and they are just as strict, in fact, some are more strict than are the limitations with respect to race, creed, political belief, and that sort of thing, in the joint resolution we are considering.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Does the gentleman have in mind limiting the \$15,000,000 to orphan children?

Mr. JUDD. No; the assistance goes to all needy children.

Mr. O'HARA. What about the children of Communist parents? How are you going to separate them?

Mr. JUDD. They will not be separated, the administrators are in charge of the relief until it goes to the ultimate consumer so that the child of Communist parents will get neither more nor less than his need entitles him to. The

main work of the fund will be to give one feeding a day to these children, so there will be at least once a day that they will get something nutritious to eat. It is hoped to get up to 600 calories in that one meal. I certainly would not withhold Minnesota powdered milk from a half-starved child just because the parents are Communists, or perhaps profess to be in order to live.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is a general impression in this country that the Soviet Union has in the United States a great many agents spreading the Communist ideology among our people. I think that impression is well-founded.

I should like to ask this question: Where does the Soviet get its money to pay its agents for doing this work? In 1933 the President of the United States officially recognized Communist Russia. The quid pro quo for that courtesy allegedly was discontinuance by Russia of Communist promotional activities in the United States. Only the naive believed the agents of the Comintern would be withdrawn from the United States. At about the time recognition was given Russia, the Congress of the United States passed the Gold Reserve Act and raised the price of gold from \$20 to \$35 an ounce and authorized the Treasury to purchase gold at the increased price from any country that offered to sell it to us in unlimited amounts. The United States bought more than \$700,000,000 of gold from Japan and paid for that gold with scrap iron, oil, airplane parts, and so forth, which Japan later threw back at us in the form of bullets and bombs.

The Treasury also bought gold in large amounts from Russia. With the credit provided by that gold the agents of Stalin were amply provided with the funds to carry on their activities in this country. Bear in mind that this is the source of the means by which Stalin has operated in the United States of America.

I wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury a few days ago and asked him whether the Treasury still favors purchasing gold from Russia. His answer was in the affirmative, which means that the administration favors continuing the policy of providing the funds for Stalin to carry on his communistic activities in this Nation. It means precisely that and nothing less.

What, I ask, is our foreign policy? Where do we stand? It is being proposed on the one hand that we deprive Russia of the facilities for Communist expansion in Europe, Asia, and other parts of the world, while on the other hand we continue through gold purchases from her to supply her agents with a vast amount of funds to carry on her communistic activities in our country.

I am not one of those who believe communism can be stopped by war or foreign grants of money. I am only pointing out the utter inconsistency of the present policy of pouring money into Europe and elsewhere to stop commu-

nism while at the same time supplying the means for its propagation here at home. Let me add, however, that if communism should overwhelm us, which God forbid, it will not be because it was foisted upon us from the outside but developed endogenously.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, at the request of the leadership, which is anxious that we speed this relief bill onward, whatever relief it provides, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Dr. JUDD a question publicly. Dr. JUDD, as you know, this particular program of relief of \$350,000,000 is generally a program of relief for approximately six countries. This is separate from the children's fund program for relief which it was contemplated would come up later. This general relief program is for \$350,000,000, and the proposed program for the children has been an additional \$50,000,000. I want to ask you whether in your opinion you feel your amendment, by putting the children's relief under this fund, will cut the total amount that will be available for children in those countries in the overall picture?

Mr. JUDD. No. My honest judgment is that this is likely to increase the amount they will get because I am genuinely afraid, I will say to the gentleman, that if we do not take care of this now in this resolution, an additional resolution coming along later when we are in a legislative jam near the end of the session will not get enacted at all. I am afraid if we do not act here the children's fund may not get anything, or at least not in time to save many, many lives.

Mr. FULTON. Therefore, we are debating on this question on the basis that it will not hurt a later approach to the children's fund.

Mr. JUDD. If the need for more develops later and it is demonstrated, Congress can and I think will provide more money. But I want to make sure now that as much as possible of the money that is provided for in this joint resolution will go where the need is greatest.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. I agree with what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] just said with reference to the amount for the children. I think it is imperative to do what is necessary now and not wait until later. I think this will help the whole proposition, and that is why I am following the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. FULTON. I am glad to have the gentleman's comments. I simply wanted to bring out this point so it would not come up later as an objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] seems to be a very, very good amendment. I wonder if by authorizing \$50,000,000 for the children's program we are not automatically cutting down on other relief and cutting it down to \$150,000,000 rather than authorizing \$200,000,000 as the bill now stands.

Mr. FULTON. That is a part of my question, whether it cuts the total amount of relief down.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not a fact that if we leave the children's fund out of this and decide to put through special legislation later for the children's fund, we can do that, but if we do not do something now, the President cannot do anything about any of it. The one important thing to do is to get this relief program going as soon as possible and not delay any of the different parts of it. If we want to take a second guess later with other legislation, we can do so.

Mr. EARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. Do I understand the language of this amendment to mean that in spite of any other restrictions in the bill this money shall be used as indicated in the amendment?

Mr. FULTON. No; it will come under the restrictions previously adopted by amendments here and which have been put in the bill by the committee.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not correct in the answer that he has just made. This money will be administered by the International Emergency Children's Fund. Its director has already laid down restrictions and limitations which are similar and in some respects even more strict, but are not identical with those we have adopted here. It cannot be handled under two sets of restrictions. For example, the conditions as to how credits are to be extended, and so forth are not applicable and should not be applied to contributions to the children's fund.

Mr. FULTON. I think the gentleman has made a real point. This children's fund then, is not under the particular restrictions of this bill. The funds are being taken out of the general relief program and a separate program is being made of it.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I think the House would like this matter cleared up. Do I understand that this fund is to be used in Communist-dominated countries?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; it can be used in Communist-dominated countries the same as the rest of the \$200,000,000 which has already been voted can be used in Communist-dominated countries subject to restrictions such as I have already referred to.

Mr. BARDEN. What was the reason the gentleman objected to putting the same restriction upon the use of these funds that we placed upon the rest of the \$200,000,000?

Mr. JUDD. Because under the rules and regulations adopted by the management of the children's fund these essential restrictions have already been established. It has been in the process of organization since last December. This is to authorize our contributions to it to help it get actual field operations going. It, itself, adopted similar restrictions long before we came along.

Mr. FULTON. If this is not under the same restrictions as the rest of the bill and is a separate program, I believe it is cutting down the total amount of relief, and it may react against the children's fund later, therefore I think the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 145, noes 10.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Strike out of section 1, lines 3 and 4 the following: "to the President not to exceed", and add after the end of section 1 the following:

"The President, by and with the consent of the Senate, shall appoint a Director, to be known as the Director of Foreign Relief, said Director to be paid a sum not to exceed \$15,000 per annum. The Director shall, in turn, appoint citizens of the United States, without any criminal record, and having no affiliation or membership in the Communist Party, to oversee relief in all countries needing such relief. These citizens to be paid the regular amounts according to their civil-service rating plus expenses while on duty abroad, and volunteers may be appointed at the discretion of the Director, and, if military or naval personnel, they shall continue to receive their regular pay and allowances as though on active service. All civilian persons appointed by the Director of Foreign Relief shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which shall certify to the Director of Foreign Relief their citizenship, criminal record, if any, and political background, and affiliations. Files shall be kept by the Federal Bureau of Investigation on all these persons and such files are to be available at all times to Members of Congress and all Federal officials acting in an official capacity."

Strike out section 2. (a) and substitute therefore the following:

"Under the direction of the Director of Foreign Relief, such relief assistance shall be provided in the form of transfers of supplies, or the establishment in this country of credits subject to the control of the Director, in such quantities and on such terms as the Director of Foreign Relief may determine; except that no such transfers of supplies or establishment of credits may be made after June 30, 1948."

Line 17, page 3 strike out "President" and substitute therefore "Director of Foreign Relief."

Line 23, page 4 strike out "President" and substitute therefore "Director of Foreign Relief."

Line 3, page 5 strike out "President" and substitute therefore "Director of Foreign Relief."

Strike out "SEC. 6. The authority of the President under sections 2, 3, and 4, to the extent the President directs, be exercised by the Secretary of State."

Strike out "SEC. 7. The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures and activities under authority of this joint resolution," and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 6. The Director of Foreign Relief shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures and activities under authority of this joint resolution."

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment I want it to be clearly understood that it is in no way a reflection or criticism on the work of the committee. I was very happy to hear at the beginning of this debate one distinguished member of the committee make the statement on the floor of the House that he would like amendments, in fact, that the committee felt that the bill needed amending. This seems to me quite apparent as we have seen a good many amendments offered by members of the committee.

It seems to me that if we turn back the pages of history a little we can see that this country of ours did the most outstanding piece of relief and welfare work not so very long ago when Herbert Hoover took over and administered Belgian relief after World War I.

It is my thought that if we can pattern the administration of this relief as closely as possible on what was done at that time we would come a little nearer perfection. I regret that owing to the change in the times volunteer service is no longer considered very important. It has seemed more necessary that this should be put under Government, and that the Director should be paid.

I think we all object to the blank-check idea—I know that my people at home object to it; and that is another reason why I have tried to get away from that and have a Director appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate.

It also seems to me in view of the discussions on the floor of this House that it is very essential that this money be administered in these countries, and wherever it is administered, by reputable American citizens. That is why that requirement is also incorporated in this amendment. We have seen what can happen when our money and nothing else is sent abroad. We know of the fiasco in Yugoslavia and other countries. We must be careful, but we want to feed the starving.

An important point I want to make is that money alone is not charity.

Unless we are willing to send people over there to do this job, to see that our dollars go where they can do good, our intentions will not be accomplished. We can do harm with money if it is not properly administered.

The purpose of my amendment is simply the proper administration of the fund that we, the Representatives, are taking from the taxpayers. I would far prefer to see the American Red Cross

and kindred organizations go out and ask the people of the United States: "Do you want to give \$200,000,000?" And I think they would give \$300,000,000. I do not think we have the right to take their money to give to any charity. I never was taught to give away other people's money. It is one thing to lend money, but it is quite another thing to say: "I will take your \$5 and give it to a relief that I think needs it."

This is a welfare bill, nothing more nor less, and as long as it is going to be administered by the Government, let it be administered so that it really will do good and not result in feeding the armies of Tito or some other dictator in Europe.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey.

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance that I rise to oppose the amendment proposed by the gentlewoman from New York, because many of the things she has stated about her amendment are thoroughly sound, and the remarks she made in its support are remarks that many of us, I am sure, agree with and all should weigh carefully. As a matter of fact, I have an amendment to propose to section 6 which will provide an administrator to be confirmed by the Senate under the President. If the committee will study the structure of the gentlewoman's amendment, they will find that throughout this bill she has substituted "administrator" for the President, so that we would have an administrator negotiating with foreign countries as to agreements and as to the carrying on of other negotiations which are necessary under this bill. I believe that we should have an administrator, and, as I say, I have a brief amendment which I shall propose to section 6 patterned after the administrator amendment adopted in the Greek-Turkish bill in the other body. This particular amendment provides, however, for military personnel and for the complete substitution of an administrator for the President in the conduct of our foreign affairs in connection with relief, which I believe goes a little too far. On the other hand, everything that the gentlewoman has said could be stated in favor of an administrator to be placed under the direction of the President, to be provided in section 6 of the bill.

I hope the pending amendment will be defeated and the same administrative result achieved without changing the conduct of our foreign relations by an amendment a little later in the bill.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is not the main purpose of the amendment which the gentleman will present, in case the amendment of the lady from New York is voted down, as I hope it will be, the recognition that the State Department is a policy-forming and not an administrative body? It was not set up to do administrative work;

it has not had much experience in that field. As a result, there has been excessive confusion in most State Department programs with which I have had contact. All of us know how difficult it usually is to find the man in the State Department who has the real authority and power in a given program. Each official refers you to another. We want to have a one-man head—one man responsible. We do not want this to be improperly administered. We want to have one man, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, to be responsible, as Mr. Hoover was responsible after World War I, so that we can be sure it will be administered to the greatest advantage.

Mr. VORYS. That is true, but we do not want to supersede the President of the United States, so the entire splendid argument made by the gentlewoman would apply to an amendment which will be offered a little bit later. I suggest that this amendment be voted down, and that you will remember her splendid remarks when provision for an administrator is proposed at a more appropriate period a little later in the day.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: At the end of section 1, add the following:

"Appropriations authorized by this joint resolution shall be available for relief in Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and in China."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in the belief that the majority of the Members of this House want it. The countries should be named. I believe that it would be a tragic mistake for us at this time to send word to these countries which are supposedly dominated by Communists that we intend to do nothing in their behalf. I do not believe that this in any way affects the so-called Colmer substitute, and it ought to be in this bill. We are faced with a situation that calls for relief. We want to give relief to these countries who are so desperately in need. Now we have the opportunity to do it.

I urge that the Committee at this time adopt this amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Would the gentleman be willing to restore to his amendment an amount, say, \$15,000,000, that could be used outside of the named countries? For instance, General Marshall has mentioned Trieste, where an emergency situation may arise. Would the gentleman be willing to restore that language to his amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman suggest an amount?

Mr. VORYS. I would say \$15,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my

amendment be corrected so as to include the sum of \$15,000,000 for the purposes named.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment would then read, after the word "China":

Provided, That the President, if he shall determine that emergency needs exist in any other country or countries, is authorized to utilize not more than \$15,000,000 for the purpose of providing relief in such other country or countries.

Is that not correct?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment reported now as it would read if unanimous consent were granted for the gentleman to modify his amendment, this not to be taken out of the gentleman's time?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: At the end of section 1 add the following:

"Appropriations authorized by this joint resolution shall be available for relief in Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and China: *Provided*, That the President, if he shall determine that emergency needs exist in any other country or countries, is authorized to utilize not more than \$15,000,000 for the purpose of providing relief in such other country or countries."

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I shall not object, I think the amendment together with the amendment to the amendment makes this bill incomparably better than it is now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, but I have asked for this recognition not so much to oppose the amendment as to see if we cannot clarify the situation a little bit. I think we have seen enough confusion here in the House this afternoon, and now we are tossing around countries and millions of dollars as children do toys. I do not know how many countries are in need. I doubt if many Members of this House know the condition of the government in Austria. I doubt if we know the conditions in Trieste and the other countries that we now seem to name.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. The countries that are named are those specifically named in the committee report, the State Department saying that relief will be limited to those countries.

Mr. BARDEN. Can the gentleman give me some idea of the type of government now existing in Austria?

Mr. HERTER. It is under military control.

Mr. BARDEN. Under whose military control?

Mr. HERTER. Russian, French, British, and our own, and there is a government that has been recognized, not by us officially, that is operating with a president and a chancellor.

Mr. BARDEN. What situation are we going to be in when we add this to the other amendments adopted?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I think I can answer the gentleman's question about the \$15,000,000.

Mr. BARDEN. I would yield to anybody who could clear it up.

Mr. MUNDT. As I understand the question, it is: Why is the \$15,000,000 made available to the countries not named in the bill? Is that correct?

Mr. BARDEN. That is one of the questions, yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I will be happy to try to answer that. It is because the bill originally is intended to cover the relief needs in war-devastated countries. There are other countries which were devastated by war besides those named herein. Trieste is a case in point, Czechoslovakia is a case in point, and Yugoslavia is another case in point. There are others. Fifteen million dollars of this amount is therefore made available in the amendment to the Smith amendment for some unforeseen emergency which might develop in those countries not named by Mr. SMITH, subject, however, to the Colmer amendment as amended by the Mundt amendment. This means American missions to distribute the relief wherever that is necessary to obtain the desired results.

Mr. BARDEN. Then the gentleman is sending this money to Czechoslovakia?

Mr. MUNDT. No.

Mr. BARDEN. Does the gentleman propose that part of it shall go there?

Mr. MUNDT. We propose to make this \$15,000,000 available should some unforeseen emergency, pestilence or something of that kind, develop, where we would be called upon to furnish relief to a country not named by Mr. SMITH's proposed amendment.

Mr. BARDEN. I thought we took care of this situation fairly well with the gentleman's amendment and the Colmer amendment, and clarified this situation as to where we wanted the money to go.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. BARDEN. Now, we come back and the gentleman presents the same argument that he presented on his amendment in support of this amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not speaking for the Smith amendment. I am pointing out why the \$15,000,000 is added. I am supporting that part of the amendment, but I am not supporting the Smith

amendment. However, if it is adopted, as seems likely, I think the provision leaving \$15,000,000 free for emergency use elsewhere is essential. With that provision in it I see no great disadvantage in the Smith amendment, but I am not supporting it.

Mr. BARDEN. You are supporting \$15,000,000 worth of his amendment, but you are not supporting his amendment?

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. BARDEN. I find there is another gentleman who is just as badly mixed up about this as I am.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Can the gentleman ascertain why the bill was brought to the floor of the House in such a hodge-podge manner and why it was not written in committee where it should have been written instead of attempting to write it on the floor of the House?

Mr. BARDEN. I am sorry I cannot answer the gentleman's question. I am very much disturbed about the same thing. If we keep shaking this bill from one side to the other, I am not so sure but that we will not tear up its very foundations. I am sure every Member of this body will recall that we overwhelmingly defeated this proposition within the last hour.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Under the Colmer amendment and the Mundt amendment, we can go into Communist-dominated countries, provided certain regulations are carried out. However, it has not been suggested that we go into any countries that might be so described except two. This amendment makes it clear that we are not under any circumstances going into Yugoslavia, Byelorussia, Romania, and Bulgaria except that \$15,000,000 is left to the discretion of the President in the case of all the war-devastated countries in case some emergency situation should arise. But that will not be enough out of the whole amount to make very much difference. This makes it clear that Congress says we are not going into Russia itself, which is a war-devastated country, and which might conceivably receive relief even under the Colmer and Mundt amendment.

Mr. BARDEN. Is the gentleman in a position to say at this point that the countries named in this amendment are the only devastated countries in Europe which are in need and which are not communistically dominated? I am opposed to financing communism directly or indirectly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. I asked the gentleman if you are in a position to say at this time

that the countries named in the amendment which is now pending are the only countries in Europe that are war-devastated and in need and which are not dominated by Communists.

Mr. VORYS. Why, no.

Mr. BARDEN. Then, why go along with the amendment?

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman knows that Yugoslavia is a Communist satellite country. There are a whole string of other countries. But the point is in the matter of relief the United Nations and the State Department have said that no countries except the ones named in this amendment are going to be included. I quote from the hearings:

The following European countries appear to have need of outside assistance: Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, and Poland. It is anticipated also that China may have emergency needs.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me a few seconds of my time?

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman was taking the time that was reserved for the committee.

Mr. BARDEN. This time was granted me by unanimous consent of this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman was late in his suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OWENS: On page 1, line 3, strike out the word "that" and insert "that inasmuch as an emergency exists in certain countries of Europe and Asia which might affect the general welfare of our Nation."

Mr. OWENS. Then I go on and state: There is hereby authorized to be appropriated—

And so forth.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. Yes; I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. I do not think it will take that long.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to again read the amendment which I have submitted. Right at the beginning, that is the first paragraph, my motion is to strike out the word "That" and insert the words "That inasmuch as an emergency exists in certain countries of Europe and Asia which might affect the welfare of our Nation"—then proceed with the balance of the paragraph. This amendment goes to the constitutionality of the measure, and permit me to state

briefly the reason why I am submitting the same. Last week, and again yesterday, I heard a great deal of debate which brings very forcibly to the fore the statement that we have heard many times previously "that where we need light we have been getting more heat." But insofar as I am concerned it has left me very cold. I read through the entire record of the proceedings and also the report of both the majority and the minority members. While a great deal was said as to the need of certain of these nations of Europe and Asia for financial aid from us, particularly with regard to medical supplies, food, and the other articles which are mentioned in the bill, no constitutional reason was given for our gift of \$350,000,000, which I understand is to be the first of a series of similar grants which former President Hoover estimated would reach \$1,500,000,000 during the coming 2-year period. Our Supreme Court has repeatedly held that a gift to a foreign nation whether in cash, credit, or tangible property must necessarily involve also the congressional power to appropriate the public money of the United States raised by taxation and apply it for such purposes.

Article I, section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution invests Congress with the power to "levy and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense of the general welfare of the United States." It is now well settled that under this provision Congress may appropriate and spend money raised by taxes for the national welfare, and that congressional discretion in selecting the means therefore is extremely broad. I appreciate fully the great need of the peoples of these nations of Europe and Asia. I appreciate also that something should be done to help them, particularly a nation like Poland, for whom we actually entered the last war, because of the vicious attack made upon that nation. However, we should be willing to state clearly and succinctly without hesitation that our purpose is to provide for the common defense and the general welfare. If we cannot pass the bill on that basis, then it cannot be passed at all. Then, if we were to grant that gift of money to the foreign nations for that purpose, it is, in my opinion, our duty to take the money from the fund which would be appropriated for the armed services. I am sure that you feel as I do that it is time for us to lay aside the methods which have brought us into two previous wars whereby we slapped and side-kicked from the sidelines without taking honest appropriate action. If we feel that we are in danger from the Soviet Union, let us take a firm stand with that nation. Tell them frankly and courageously what we feel should be done in the matter. If we of Congress do this the people of the Nation are going to respect our action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS] has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I will take but a few seconds in speaking in opposition to this amendment for it does nothing but amend the preamble. It

does not change the content or the purport of the bill. It simply puts a price tag on this relief and tells the countries of the world that we are glad to help because we think it is going to pay off for us. I do not believe that would be appropriate. Certainly we have other obligations besides this one of selfishness in this matter. I urge that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact that the report of the committee to this House is an official part of this record and that if that indicates a constitutional basis for the granting of this relief it is sufficient without any preamble to the resolution?

Mr. MUNDT. I think the preamble to the resolution at least does nothing to change the purport or content of the bill. I never have had too much confidence in the controlling influence of a committee report, but I am convinced that this bill will stand any constitutional scrutiny as written at the present time.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. Will the gentleman tell me where in the bill there is a statement of purpose?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; at the very beginning it reads:

This bill is to provide for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

That is the primary purpose of this bill.

Mr. OWENS. Will the gentleman admit that the Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly held that that is not sufficient in itself unless there is compliance with this section of the Constitution which I have read?

Mr. MUNDT. I am afraid I cannot recall all of the decisions of the Supreme Court here on the spur of the moment so as to answer your question, but certainly any Supreme Court that upheld our participation in UNRRA will uphold our participation in this all-American relief program.

I decline to yield further, Mr. Chairman, because we are trying to finish this bill today.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois?

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Under the direction of the President, such relief assistance shall be provided in the form of transfers of supplies, or the establishment in this country of credits subject to the control of the President, in such quantities and on such terms as the President may determine; except that no such transfers of supplies or establishment of credits may be made after June 30, 1948.

(b) In carrying out this joint resolution, funds appropriated pursuant thereto may be used to pay necessary expenses related to the providing of such relief assistance, including expenses of or incident to the procurement, storage, transportation, and shipment of supplies transferred under subsection

(a) or of supplies purchased from credits established under subsection (a).

(c) Sums from the appropriations made pursuant to this joint resolution may be allocated for any of the purposes of this joint resolution to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government and such sums shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with the laws governing obligations and expenditures of the department, agency, or independent establishment, or organizational unit thereof concerned, and without regard to sections 3709 and 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 41, sec. 5, and title 31, sec. 529).

(d) When any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government receives request from the government of any country for which credits have been established under subsection (a) and receives, from credits so established, advancements or reimbursements for the cost and necessary expenses, it may furnish, or procure and furnish (if advancements are made), supplies within the category of relief assistance as defined in section 1 and may use sums so received for the purposes set forth in subsection (b) of this section. When any such reimbursement is made it shall be credited, at the option of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account which is current at the time of such reimbursement.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: Page 3, line 13, at the end of section 2 insert the following:

"(e) Not more than 10 percent of the appropriations authorized by this resolution shall be expended for the procurement of relief supplies in countries other than the United States. The relief supplies provided under the terms of this joint resolution shall be procured and furnished by the appropriate United States procurement agencies unless the President shall determine otherwise."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment contains two suggestions made by Mr. Hoover which I understand are acceptable to the Department of State and are drafted in the language provided by Mr. Tyler Wood of the State Department who was with us during our committee discussions.

The purpose is to not have us spend our money outside of the country for supplies with the hope that other countries will come in and contribute supplies; if they find they can get money from the United States they might not be disposed so to contribute.

The other provision is that the procurement in this country shall be under the appropriate United States procurement agency so as not to have foreign countries, recipients of relief money, bidding for supplies in the American market. These are what might be called good housekeeping administrative amendments, and I believe that there is no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, an hour or so ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] and more recently the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. EARDEN] said that our thinking on this entire measure is muddled. I agree with them. Clear thinking requires facts and most of the facts behind this measure were marked secret and have never been communicated to us. We are not only writing blank checks, we are writing blank checks in the dark.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONKMAN: Page 2, line 5, after the words "be made after", strike out "June 30, 1948" and insert "December 31, 1947."

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, as I said in support of the first amendment reducing the \$350,000,000 to \$200,000,000, this amendment is complementary to it. If they had related to the same section I would have offered them simultaneously, but being in different sections I could not do that. However, all of the arguments which I made on behalf of the other amendment apply to this amendment.

There is a wealth of information, facts and evidence telling us that there will be no need for relief after 1947, that there will be no need for relief in these countries in 1948 except some of the members of the State Department say, "With the possible exception of Austria." Not the probable exception of Austria, but the possible exception of Austria. They may need some limited relief after that time.

Now, that is only a possibility. If that should occur there is enough in the bill for them to get some stuff into Austria to take care of the situation or, on the other hand, Congress will be in session again at that time.

Why should we insist upon ending this on December 31, 1947? As I said before, when we passed the last authorization for UNRRA in the sum of \$1,350,000,000, I offered an amendment at that time that the President should serve notice on UNRRA that we are withdrawing from UNRRA at the end of that time and there was a provision in the basic law that we should withdraw. Why? There must come an end to this relief. At some time we have to begin to whittle down. The amendment was defeated at that time, although the leadership said it was a very good amendment, that I should bring it up independently. I did not do that.

Mr. Chairman, we are giving the State Department, the administration, everything they ask for if we limit this to December 31, 1947. There is not a single word in the hearings against doing that and there is not a single word in the hearings that says that we should extend it beyond that date.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman feel that in case we accept his amend-

ment, and along about November it looks as if the money is not going to be needed, some excuse will be found for spending it anyway, so that it would be better to have it strung over the whole year rather than until December?

Mr. JONKMAN. No, indeed not. The Committee was informed that the \$350,000,000 was to last through the first crop year, and that is all they would need. We were given the same assurance, and this thing will drag on and on continuously otherwise. If there was any evidence whatsoever, if there was a scintilla of evidence of necessity to continue this through the fiscal year, there might be some argument, but there is none whatsoever, and at the same time there should not be any question in our minds whatsoever to adopt this amendment. Now is the time to do it.

Let me repeat: We are giving them everything they ask for. It is said here, for instance, that we are not strengthening the hands of our Secretary of State, General Marshall, if we cut it down. We are not cutting it down. It might even be that the date June 30, 1948, is merely a mistake, because the fiscal year ends at that time. There is no reason for it.

I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the House has already limited the amount to be expended to \$200,000,000. It now proposes to run exactly counter to its efforts at economy if it passes this amendment, for this reason:

The bill reads, on page 2, lines 4 and 5:

No such transfers of supplies or establishment of credits may be made after June 30, 1948.

By the amendment it is sought to change that date and to provide that no such transfers of supplies or establishment of credits may be made after December 31, 1947. What will happen will be that all the credits will be established prior to December 31, 1947. The \$200,000,000 will be used up anyhow and the administration will be in here on the 3d of January 1948 with a new bill asking for more money, whereas if you defeat this amendment, at least you show your intention that the amount you are appropriating, reduced as it is, shall cover the period to June 30, 1948.

I respectfully submit that the amendment must be defeated if you are to be consistent.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that those who are economy minded ordinarily attempt to stretch appropriations and authorizations as far as possible rather

than to limit the expenditure to a shorter time? That is the proposition involved here. I hope that we encourage the spreading of the appropriations and authorizations as far as possible rather than encouraging the speeding up of the spending of the money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. No relief assistance shall be provided under the authority of this joint resolution to the people of any country unless the government of such country has given assurance satisfactory to the President that (a) the supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, as well as similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, will be distributed among the people of such country without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief; (b) representatives of the Government of the United States and of the press and radio of the United States will be permitted to observe freely and to report fully regarding the distribution and utilization of such supplies; (c) full and continuous publicity will be given within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts, and progress of the United States relief program carried on therein pursuant to this joint resolution; (d) if food, medical supplies, fertilizer, or seed is transferred or otherwise made available to such country pursuant to this joint resolution, no articles of the same character will be exported or removed from such country while in need therefor for relief purposes continues; (e) such country has taken or is taking, insofar as possible, the economic measures necessary to reduce its relief needs and to provide for its own future reconstruction; (f) upon request of the President, it will furnish promptly information concerning the production, use, distribution, importation, and exportation of any supplies which affect the relief needs of the people of such country; and (g) representatives of the Government of the United States will be permitted to supervise the distribution among the people of such country of the supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: At the end of section 3 strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "(h) That when relief supplies procured with the funds authorized by this joint resolution are sold by any receiving government for local currency, the amounts of such local currency shall be deposited by that government in a special account and shall be used only for relief and rehabilitation purposes with the approval of the duly authorized representative of the United States."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, I believe, is self-explanatory. It is, of course, obvious that most of these relief supplies—grain, and so forth—are going to be distributed in the countries through their regular distribution systems. This amendment provides that the money which constitutes the proceeds of the sale of these supplies shall be impounded in a special fund in the local currency and used only for

relief and rehabilitation purposes under the approval of the representatives of the United States. Similar arrangements were provided under UNRRA. We found that a similar proposition was going to be incorporated in the contracts to be made with the countries. This language in my amendment was drafted by a representative of the State Department. I do not believe there is now any objection to this provision.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is it not the intention of the gentleman that these funds that are recaptured in a country shall be used only for relief and rehabilitation in that particular country? Would not the gentleman accept that amendment?

Mr. VORYS. I feel that it would be better to leave the language as drafted because if the country involved and the United States representative agreed, conceivably, that some relief or rehabilitation should take place in another country and it could be financed by local currency, I do not think we should put in here something that would block that use of the money, although that is, of course, not required one way or the other. I do not think we ought to tie the hands of the administration by requiring that this money be expended for relief or rehabilitation in any particular spot.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is it not a fact that under the gentleman's amendment if funds were recaptured in Poland they could be used by this administration in Hungary? Then you have the question of foreign exchange and different currencies and all those problems.

Mr. VORYS. You would have the question of foreign exchange immediately, but if you can conceive of a situation where, let us say, in Italy as the result of the sale of American relief supplies the Government had an amount of lire on hand and could purchase something that could be used in another country needing relief, it seems to me we ought not to put in here anything that would prevent that sort of use of that currency. But the provision for impounding the local currency is such that I do not conceive that there would be many instances of that kind.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is not one of the purposes of this amendment to avoid any possibility of the thing that happened in Yugoslavia, where UNRRA sent in supplies and they were sold by Tito's government and he used the proceeds to pay more soldiers? We want the money that comes from the sale of these relief supplies to be used for relief purposes in their own country, if needed. There conceivably could be a case, for example, in Poland, which the gentleman mentioned, and which normally has agricultural products to export, where they would have a boom crop and surpluses. Under this amendment they would use the Polish currency from the sale of re-

lief supplies to buy their local agricultural surpluses to be delivered at the border of Hungary, for example, to help relieve starvation there, if it should exist. Maybe such an instance would not develop. But if it should, then this is a good safeguard to prevent misuse of the funds a government secures from the sale of relief supplies in that country.

Mr. VORYS. Certainly no such provision would be carried out unless the President and the administrator wanted to do it. I do not see why we need to tie the hands of the President in this regard.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, will not the gentleman agree to an amendment to his amendment to insert on the sixth line of his amendment after the words "relief and rehabilitation purposes" the words "within that country"? I think that will meet the situation. In other words, it allows everything that the gentleman proposes here, except it does not allow these recaptured funds to be carried from one country and used in some other country.

Mr. VORYS. I am in a position here of protecting the discretion of the President and the relief administrator. The gentleman wants to tie the hands of the President in advance, if the situation should arise where the United States representative under his direction would wish to ask that relief and rehabilitation be provided for some other country. I do not think it is necessary because I do not think many such situations would arise. But I do not believe we should bar that possibility.

Mr. RICHARDS. I shall not insist.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may have three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. I believe the gentleman from Minnesota referred to the fact that in the event there were surpluses in Poland the money allotted for the Polish program could probably be used for the purpose of buying surpluses to use elsewhere. Did I understand that correctly?

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman did not understand correctly.

Mr. DINGELL. Certainly that is a desirable thing. Would that not go further to aid Poland in her reconstruction for the future?

Mr. VORYS. No; the gentleman is in error in this way. If supplies were furnished to Poland which were sold and which resulted in income in Polish money, then there would be a possibility if there were surpluses in Poland that money which is in Polish exchange could be used to buy Polish supplies and conceivably used elsewhere. But it seems to me that is making our dollar do double work, and it is a good idea.

Mr. DINGELL. I am in agreement with that. I do not believe we ought to subscribe to any amendment at this late moment.

Mr. VORYS. I agree with the gentleman. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I have followed this debate with much interest and with deep concern. I have been pleased to vote in favor of amendments specifying the countries to receive aid, such as Poland, and certain other countries, as well as to set up definite procedures to prevent American aid from being misused by Communist-controlled puppet governments. The debate thus far on the floor of the House has indicated, in my opinion, a desire on the part of the American people to help their less fortunate friends abroad and at the same time this debate has indicated a deep-seated conviction that the administration of relief funds in the past has been badly handled. This bill as written and as amended on the floor of the House does what it is supposed to do. It provides aid to the needy.

I rise at this point not to carry on that particular line of argument but rather to ask the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, a question which many of my constituents have asked me—Does House Joint Resolution 153, providing for relief assistance to the people of the countries devastated by war, further weaken the United Nations?

Mr. EATON. My answer to that is "No."

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Will the gentleman please explain his answer in more detail?

Mr. EATON. My explanation is simply this: The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is an international organization and it ends shortly. The need developed after the ending of this. The matter was considered by the United Nations and our own representatives made this proposal, that from now on, in finishing the work that was left by UNRRA, we do it on a unilateral basis, and that was agreed to by the United Nations Authority. Consequently, it is not by-passing but is acting in accord with the understanding of the United Nations.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee this question: In other words, the unilateral position, which the chairman has mentioned, throws the entire burden on the people of the United States, does it not?

Mr. EATON. No.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then, who else is participating in this relief program which is a perpetuation of UNRRA?

Mr. EATON. The amount proposed for relief was \$610,000,000. The United

States agreed to take 57 percent of that. We have backed away from that. Meanwhile, Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand have offered to come in and it is hoped that many others will do so.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What other countries are making a contribution to the \$350,000,000 carried in this bill? What other countries are making contributions?

Mr. EATON. Here is what the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted on December 12, 1946: A resolution urging the following performance of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration: Residual relief needs in such countries be made during the ensuing year, through the development of the respective programs of all members of the United Nations.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, the \$350,000,000 program here presented is the portion assigned to the United States?

Mr. EATON. Not assigned, but suggested.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, assumed by the United States.

Mr. EATON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What portion is England assuming and what portion is Canada assuming and what portion is Australia and New Zealand assuming?

Mr. EATON. My latest advice is that the definite assumption of those nations has not yet been made, but they have given assurance that they will stand up and do their part in accordance with the suggestion.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But as far as the record shows at this moment, then, the United States, through this \$350,000,000 or \$200,000,000 carries on the finishing up work of UNRRA?

Mr. EATON. But we have taken no definite position that unless the other nations come across and agree exactly as we have that we will quit.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is exactly the point. We carry on whether they drop out or not.

Mr. EATON. Well, the obligation that we assumed we consider is our obligation, and in assuming that we discharge our obligation and do not mix up with the obligation of the others.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield.

Mr. JONKMAN. The only thing we can go on is the record, and here is the last word on it from Dean Acheson:

Question. What assurances or expectations do we have of assistance to the countries to be benefited from other countries than our own as contemplated by the program?

Answer. The British have announced a program of \$40,000,000 in aid to Austria.

I have already shown that is a straight loan; a sterling loan.

The Norwegian Parliament has voted the equivalent of \$3,000,000. Denmark is making available the equivalent of \$4,000,000. New Zealand has stated its intention to make available some meat and other commodities. On the basis of consultations which have been conducted with other countries we believe that additional contributions will

be forthcoming if favorable action is taken by the United States, since some countries are waiting to see what action we take.

Mr. EATON. And I may say the New Zealand meat will be largely horse meat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that the question just asked and the answer given, that other nations will not contribute, are an argument for more and not less money, as far as we are concerned?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. The gentleman can reach his own conclusion on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. When supplies are transferred or otherwise made available to any country pursuant to this joint resolution, the President shall cause representatives of the Government of the United States (1) to supervise the distribution of such supplies among the people of such country, and (2) to observe and report with respect to the carrying out of the assurances given to the President pursuant to section 3.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, in view of the fact we do not know what the amendment is or how much we should debate it, I object to the request.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LODGE:

Page 4, line 25, strike out the word "and."

Page 5, line 2, strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "and (3) make certain that reparations payable by any such country to any other country by treaty have been postponed during the period of such relief."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, in effect, provides that treaty reparations shall be postponed during the period of this relief.

The purposes of this amendment are: (a) To provide relief for Hungary in spite of armistice reparations imposed by Soviet Russia;

(b) To prevent the payment of reparations by Hungary;

(c) If this is not done, to postpone the payment of these reparations until Hungary has recovered from the ravages of war; and

(d) To protect the American taxpayer from making payments toward reparations while he is paying for relief.

In his testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee of this body, the for-

mer President of the United States, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, remarked:

The nations receiving reparations from relief countries should be asked at once to defer reparations until these relief costs are repaid. The justice of this proposal lies in the fact that this relief obviously serves to preserve the manpower productivity of that country and therefore its ability to pay reparations (p. 56 of the hearings on H. J. Res. 153.)

I do not happen to believe that it is wise to require payment of the relief costs. It does not seem to me sound or feasible to require needy countries to borrow for relief such commodities as food, although it would appear quite proper to make rehabilitation and reconstruction items the subject of loans since these can be used in obtaining foreign exchange. But I do feel that the payment of reparations by such countries should be deferred while they are receiving relief.

The reason why this amendment refers specifically to reparations provided by treaty is because Hungary is, under the armistice provisions with Soviet Russia, currently paying \$23,000,000 a year in reparations, which reparations would have the effect of increasing the relief needs of Hungary. In reply to a line of questions of mine, Mr. Clayton, the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, stated in his testimony:

I want the record to be clear on this point: I am not informed that in the case of Hungary, reparations payments of \$23,000,000 a year are of a character which would affect its relief needs. We have taken that into account in making these estimates (p. 38 of the hearings on H. J. Res. 153.)

It seems to me unfair to deprive Hungary of relief because reparations have been forced upon her by Soviet Russia under the terms of the armistice. Shortly after the end of the war the Hungarians manifested their desire for a democratic form of government by a vote of 95 to 5. They should not now be penalized for their anticommunism.

But with respect to the future and particularly in view of the President's address to the joint session of Congress on March 12, it seems to me essential that the American taxpayer should not be burdened both with relief for countries devastated by war and with payments which would eventually constitute reparations to totalitarian countries. Indeed, our distinguished Secretary of State, General Marshall, has made this very clear in connection with the Russian desire to obtain German reparations payments from current production. General Marshall has indicated his unwillingness to transfer a substantial part of the burden of German reparations to the backs of the American taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to adopt the policy enunciated by the President, let us hew to that policy. No country can afford to follow two conflicting policies at one and the same time. We cannot successfully hunt with the hounds while we are running with the hares.

The problem of bringing relief through Communist-dominated puppet govern-

ments is at best a difficult one. Our experience with UNRRA left much to be desired. There will probably be grave difficulties in connection with this United States program. And yet I feel that we must not condemn to death by starvation those people who have been stalwart and staunch in their opposition to Communist pressure. We must endeavor to bring this relief to the needy and not to bolstering the black markets which abound under these Communist oligarchies.

But although this relief must go forward, it is entirely fitting that we should require that during the life of this legislation no reparations be paid since such reparations will increase the relief needs of countries to which we propose to bring relief assistance.

If this amendment is adopted, it will, in my opinion, have a most salutary and resounding effect. It will reassure the taxpayers of this country as to the expenditure of their money for relief in devastated countries. It will demonstrate our conviction that we played our full part in the recent war and that it is neither necessary nor appropriate that we now make additional payments by way of reparations. Finally, it will indicate to all the world that although we are bent on relieving suffering and starvation we are also determined not to assist the antifreedom forces which, in spite of the war's end, are still very much on the march.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments end at 5:30.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the Chairman have any idea how many more amendments there are?

Mr. EATON. I am advised there are two more amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. There are three on the Clerk's desk.

Mr. EATON. Does that include the pending amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Including the pending amendment.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I understand if we finish at half-past 5 there will be at least three roll calls. There are some who have to be at the White House this evening.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, of course, I do not know how many roll calls there will be, and I do not know whether anyone can make any determination about that, but certainly whether or not there are roll calls or how much longer it might take would involve a determination by the leadership as to whether we should continue tonight or not. But the limi-

tation of time would simply bring us to the voting point on the bill.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. Does our distinguished leader have any objection to this going over until tomorrow to be voted on?

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know what the prospect will be in respect to voting, so I would not want to undertake to say about that. But, certainly, there should be no objection, if this is a fair limitation of time for the remaining amendments and the consideration of the bill, to conclude this evening.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, it seems to me there should be 10 minutes on each amendment.

Mr. EATON. There will be that amount of time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. (a) The President shall promptly terminate the provision of relief assistance to the people of any country whenever he determines (1) that, by reason of changed conditions, the provision of relief assistance of the character authorized by this joint resolution is no longer necessary, (2) that any of the assurances given pursuant to section 3 are not being carried out, (3) that an excessive amount of any supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, or of similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, is being used to assist in the maintenance of armed forces in such country, or (4) that supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, or similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, are being exported or removed from such country.

(b) Relief assistance to the people of any country, under this joint resolution, shall, unless sooner terminated by the President, be terminated whenever such termination is directed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress.

Sec. 6. The authority of the President under sections 2, 3, and 4 may, to the extent the President directs, be exercised by the Secretary of State.

Sec. 7. The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures and activities under authority of this joint resolution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment because I think it should be clear to the House exactly what this amendment means. A similar amendment came up before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and was voted down because the purport of the amendment—and I ask this in a form of a question of my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE], with whom I am generally on the same side—the purport of this amendment is to endeavor to cause the Senate to reject the Hungarian Treaty which is now before it because if the Senate approved the treaty relief would not move to Hungary. Therefore, if the House votes for this amendment, what it is doing is saying that if the Senate ratifies the treaty no

relief shall move to Hungary. I ask the gentleman that question.

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the gentleman that as the situation looks now my amendment would appear to include only Hungary, but, of course, Austria may be called upon to pay reparations, in which case it would include Austria. The case of Italy is different since reparations under the Italian treaty will be postponed 2 years, so that Italy is not affected.

I will say this, that at the time my amendment was voted down in committee, General Marshall had not yet returned from Moscow. We now know that he is opposed to the American people paying out a lot of money in reparations, and it is my hope that these treaties will be defeated in order not to treat these reparations on the American taxpayers and also on these people.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Did not General Marshall announce at Moscow the American principle that we are not willing in the case of Germany to pour in relief at one end while our former Allies take out reparations at the other, and does not that apply with equal force to the other peace treaties?

Mr. JAVITS. I think the House now has it very clearly that no relief will move to Hungary if the treaty before the Senate carrying Hungarian reparations is ratified, and that therefore the House would be saying that it wants a new Hungarian treaty if it adopts this amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Relief will go forward to Hungary. The gentleman prophesies that the Hungarian treaty will be ratified. I am inclined to think that the other body will not do so. In any event, I want relief to go to Hungary and I also do not want the Hungarians and, incidentally, the Americans, to have to pay reparations to Soviet Russia. That is the purpose of my amendment. It is to provide relief for the Hungarians and not to deprive them of it. It is to protect the Hungarians from onerous and unjust treaty reparations. It is to protect the American taxpayers from the burden of reparations while they are burdened with relief.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. May I ask the gentleman from Connecticut this question: Is it not a fact that the only ground upon which relief will not go to Hungary under the gentleman's amendment will be if the Senate ratifies the existing treaty?

Mr. LODGE. That is correct. I feel that a country which needs relief as badly as Hungary should not be called upon to pay reparations. My purpose is to protect the Hungarians from the loss of relief, from having to pay reparations, and at the same time to protect the American taxpayer.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MATHEWS. May I ask either of these gentlemen who are members of the committee how Great Britain can pay \$40,000,000 of this when she borrowed \$3,750,000,000 from us and is now retiring from Greece because she cannot bear the financial burden there?

Mr. JAVITS. I respectfully submit that the question is not germane to this discussion, the \$40,000,000 is a sterling loan of Great Britain to Austria.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 90, noes 37.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: On page 5, strike out lines 23 to 25, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 6. Relief assistance under this joint resolution shall be administered, to the extent the President directs, by a Relief Administrator who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall perform such functions relating to the administration of this act as the President shall prescribe. The Administrator shall receive such salary and have such staff as the President shall determine."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late. In commenting upon the amendment offered earlier by the gentlewoman from New York, I think I described this amendment. This leaves the Administrator under the President, and does not attempt to substitute the Administrator for the President, but provides, as is provided in the Greek-Turkish relief bill in the form it passed the Senate, for a relief administrator to be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate and to conduct the relief administration under the direction of the President.

Mr. Chairman, there has been some talk to the effect that a Senate confirmation might involve some delay. The United States Senate has already confirmed 12,500 executive appointments this year up to April 15. I am sure that a good appointment will be promptly confirmed.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Will the Administrator, under section 4, in the supervision of the distribution of these supplies that are purchased with the money that is authorized here, see that the people of these devastated countries who are without food and money to buy the food can get some of this relief?

Mr. VORYS. That is provided in the specimen agreements which were submitted to the committee. The rationing system must not only provide for sale but for free rations for those who need it.

Mr. BARRETT. Who gets the preference—the man with the money or the fellow without the money to buy the food?

Mr. VORYS. As I stated, there is a minimum ration to be distributed, whether there is money available to pay for it or not. That is provided in the specimen agreements.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This amendment simply substitutes for General Marshall another appointee by the President to be confirmed by the Senate. Not only is this a matter of foreign policy, but I wish to point out that we have General Marshall, a Cabinet officer, who has already been confirmed and who attends to these matters of foreign policy. I am convinced that today, particularly, would be a very unfortunate time to eliminate him by this bill and substitute anybody else for General Marshall just when he has returned from his mission to Moscow and made his report, as all of you know, last night. It seems to me that it would be quite unfortunate, as I say, to substitute anybody for him at this particular time.

Furthermore, this matter has been delayed entirely too long. I am afraid it is an unfortunate fact that because of that delay, some of which I thought was unnecessary although I may be wrong, many people are going to starve. Certainly when we already have an officer of our Government who has been confirmed by the Senate and is ready to act and who I think is acting excellently in foreign affairs, I cannot conceive of the idea of further delaying the matter to cause a confirmation by the Senate to be necessary, despite what my genial friend, the gentleman from Ohio, says about the 3,000 executive appointees having been confirmed. I call attention to the fact that we also had a Lillenthal confirmation debate.

One other thing, it is passing strange that although my friends on the other side have been talking about bureaus all these years and are still talking about them, you now want to create a new bureau to perform a function for which we already have someone who is quite competent.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield gladly.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman knows that General Marshall is not going to administer this. According to a letter that we had from Acting Secretary Acheson, a man by the name of Mr. Dick Allen, formerly with the Red Cross, is the man who is proposed. If that man is as good as we are told he is, I have no doubt of his confirmation by the Senate. If there is something wrong with him, that is something else, but General Marshall is not going to administer this. We have already been told who is going to do it.

Mr. JARMAN. Of course, it would be administered in Europe. Undoubtedly that man would be appointed, I judge, from what the gentleman says, but why run any risk of further delaying this matter? Particularly as I say at this

time, why slap General Marshall in the face?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman wants to have anything in the nature of relief revert to the kind of administration we have got on this relief program out of the State Department under UNRRA? I think that is about as bad as anything that ever happened.

Mr. JARMAN. Under UNRRA we had a director, just as the gentleman wants now, as I understand it.

Mr. TABER. Not confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. RAYBURN. The same man who appointed him would have to appoint somebody else.

Mr. JARMAN. Yes; the same man would appoint him.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is it not more necessary than ever today to synchronize our relief efforts with our foreign policy?

Mr. JARMAN. There is no question about that.

Mr. RICHARDS. The man who is to be in supreme charge of our foreign policy should be in supreme charge of relief.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. VORYS. My amendment leaves the man who is in charge of our foreign policy still with full responsibility over this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICHARDS) there were—ayes 120, noes 67.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of California: That House Joint Resolution 153 be amended by adding a new section thereto to be known as section 6 (a), which shall follow section 6 and precede section 7 of the resolution, as follows to wit:

"SEC. 6 (a). The officers or agencies authorized or designated to carry out the provisions of this resolution shall, wherever possible, administer said resolution in accordance with the following principles: That wherever possible dehydrated or dried foodstuffs shall be used, providing they meet the relief situation at the place where they are to be shipped, and meet the nutrition requirements of the people who are to eat the food. If consistent with these requirements foodstuffs of such types and kinds shall be used as may be helpful to our domestic economy."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the only purpose of offering this amendment was to raise the problem of the administration of this act. I

am thoroughly in accord with the resolution and intend to vote for it, because in 1945 I made a trip with a subcommittee to Europe and learned by personal observation in what a chaotic condition the people of Europe live. I think I thoroughly understand the need for this sort of action but I think we should try in the administration of this act to mesh the welfare of the American economy with relief to the devastated areas and to the hungry people of Europe. I therefore mention the fact that where we can we should use dehydrated foods and we should use foods of which there are surpluses.

For instance, just to illustrate the point I am trying to explain, today there are on the market 4,000,000 pounds of dehydrated onions which the Army and Navy have turned back to the contractors who sold the onions to the services. The ratio of dehydrated onions to fresh onions is 10 to 1. That is, that each pound of dried onions was made from 10 pounds of fresh onions. There are therefore 40,000,000 pounds of this food now on the market and if we do not find some outlet for it, outside of our own country, the whole onion market this year and next will collapse and our economy as far as those raising or handling onions will be very badly damaged.

Then there are some dried fruits that are also in surplus. Here the ratio is about 1 pound of dried fruit represents 4 pounds of fresh fruit.

In the dehydrating of fruits and vegetables, none of the vitamins or nutrition of the fresh product is lost. All that is required is to soak the fruit or vegetable in water, and it is ready for cooking. In the shipment of this type of food it can be seen that only one-tenth or one-fourth of the space or weight is required to give the same number of vitamins or the same amount of nutrition, as if the fresh product were sent. The resultant saving in hauling charges, ships, labor, and so forth, is tremendous, but the starving people get just as much food.

My only purpose in presenting this amendment is to try to get a little common sense into the administration of this act, because we have had so many curious results and disappointments from the administration of these various relief programs. If there are surplus foods having the proper nutritional value and of the right kind for the area and people involved we should use them and thus help our economy.

The question I want to ask the chairman is this—and I have heretofore presented this amendment to the chairman: Is it the gentleman's understanding from the hearings that were held that the matter of administering this relief will be in accordance with the principles of the amendment I have offered, namely, that we will use foods that have the proper nutritional value, that are of the right kind for the people involved, and, if possible, use foods which are in surplus?

Mr. EATON. I may say in reply to the gentleman from California that that is the assumption upon which the committee has acted, that we have the best food available, procured in such way as

would be for the advancement of our own economy.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman; your answer is appreciated and a good yardstick for administrators of this act.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield. Mr. SADOWSKI. Are these onions California onions?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Some are from California and some are from many other States. It is not a California matter, it is a humane matter, but of course we want these poor people to have the best, so, naturally, they should get some California fruits and vegetables.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment. The chairman's answer satisfies me.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 153, providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, pursuant to House Resolution 187, he reported the resolution back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Jonkman amendment and also a separate vote on the Colmer-Mundt amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the votes on the amendments and the bill go over until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to include in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today certain editorials.

PORTAL-TO-PORTAL ACT OF 1947

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2157) to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and in-

clude an article appearing in Sunday's New York Times magazine section.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be permitted to sit during general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow during general debate the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow during general debate the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to hold hearings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in reference to General Bliss.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GATHINGS (at the request of Mr. CRAVENS) for today and tomorrow on account of absence on official business.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] is recognized for 20 minutes.

RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I have long been troubled with the ultimate effect that the Reciprocal Trade Act will have on the industry of America and its labor force. When Congress extended this act in 1945 for an additional 3 years, and provided that tariffs might be

lowered by another 50 percent, we abdicated our control over tariffs and delegated all our responsibility to the executive department. It was for this reason that I then spoke against the passage of the bill and voted against it, and in the 2 years that have passed since then, during which I have given continuous study to the question, I have not changed my mind.

I represent the Second Congressional District of New Jersey, which comprises Atlantic, Cumberland, and Cape May Counties. This is the home of many substantial industries. Food processing and the manufacture of clothing is carried on extensively. Commercial fishing is of great importance. And primarily, so far as tariff questions are concerned, the district, particularly Cumberland County, is one of the most important producers of glassware in the United States.

There are today between 9,000 and 10,000 workers occupied in the production of glass products in this district. The glassware manufactured here varies from ordinary containers to intricate apparatus for laboratory use, and represents a sales volume between \$30,000,000 and \$35,000,000 per annum.

The actual labor involved represents from 25 percent of the cost of fully automatic machine-made containers to 89 percent in the production of glass apparatus for laboratory or industrial use.

The average hourly wages, on a basis of a 40-hour work week, range from \$0.985 to \$1.644.

During the past 10 years, wage rates have increased 107 percent for male workers and 135 percent for female help. The plant and equipment investment per worker averages about \$4,000.

I would like to say in passing that the labor relations in this industry in my district have been for the most part exceptionally good, and the combination of excellent management and high-grade workers made an important contribution of vital materials to the United States during the war.

This essential industry and other important businesses in my area are threatened by the power of the executive department to manipulate and decrease tariffs. The International Conference at Geneva, which began April 8, can spell the difference between the continuance and discontinuance of this and many American enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe in the exclusion of foreign products, and I recognize the necessity of cultivating foreign trade, but there are some specified industries which by their very nature require reasonable and adequate protection; and require, in my judgment, that that protection be guarded and provided by the elected representatives of the people in Congress, and not by the State Department, which in its zeal to cultivate our foreign relations often neglects our domestic welfare.

It is for this reason that I have introduced a bill to restore to Congress at least the right of veto of tariff treaties which are harmful. I think the bill is necessary, and I hope it will have the

prompt attention of the Ways and Means Committee and of the House. It does not interfere with the international conference about to proceed, and it does not retard foreign trade. It merely restores to the Congress, where it rightfully belongs, ultimate authority over tariff questions, the protection of the American worker and American industry. The bill is brief, and reads as follows:

A bill to require approval by Congress of Executive agreements with respect to the reduction of tariff rates before the same becomes effective

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the effective date of this act no Executive agreement which contains any provision for reduction of tariff rates shall become effective until such agreement shall have been filed for a period of 90 days with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and with the Secretary of the Senate. If during such period of 90 days the Congress shall, by joint resolution, disapprove the agreement, it shall not thereafter be executed and shall for all purposes be void.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution gives the Congress jurisdiction over the regulation of foreign trade, custom duties, and tariffs. When Congress passed the original Reciprocal Trade Act in 1934, as well as the extensions of that act, it abdicated its responsibility under the Constitution, and departed from a program which had been in effect in this country for many years.

It is my feeling that Congress should take action to restrain or delay the negotiating of reciprocal treaties which are about to be undertaken. If agreements are made now, they should be very flexible. World conditions are changing rapidly and trade agreements must reflect such changes.

If the United States is to help in mending a torn world, we must maintain a sound productive economy within our own borders. Domestic producers and manufacturers must be in a position to compete in the domestic market on an equitable basis with foreign products of similar character. An equitable tariff cannot be considered a barrier to trade; it has the opposite effect. Fair competition is stimulating to business. At this time nearly all of the other countries of the world with whom the treaties are to be negotiated have nationalized industry, and for us to believe that the free enterprise of this country can compete with nationalized industry in other countries is fantastic, unless adequate safeguards are provided. Before negotiating treaties we should have definite assurances as to wage scales that are going to be maintained abroad, agreements that governments will not use their nationalized industries to pour foreign products into our country to the great detriment of our own labor and industries.

Another matter of great concern is the question of protecting certain key industries in the United States which have made it possible for this country to wage two successful wars. Tariffs should not be lowered on the products of these key industries, as they are indispensable to our national existence and our very life.

Most of these industries are highly specialized and require the highest type of both skilled and unskilled workers. Labor costs are one of the most important factors, and we must not subject these industries to foreign competition that would render them impotent. While at the present time labor and industry seem to be far apart on many of their problems, their interests dovetail on tariffs, and many labor unions throughout the United States have joined in the protest against the lowering of tariff rates and have filled briefs with the Reciprocity Information Committee. One prominent union, representing thousands of workers, stated in its protest:

We are not opposed to imports even though those which are competitive with the products of our own American workers. We are opposed to the entry into America's market of competitive articles, delivered at total wholesale costs, duties paid, which are less than our costs of production.

We do not seek any monopoly. However, we will not knowingly or willingly permit any Government officials to deprive us of our work opportunities, and make us dependent on either the charity of the Government, our relatives, or our friends in order to satisfy the theories of some or to add to the riches of others.

We contend that with the changed conditions which now exist in Germany, Japan, Czechoslovakia, and other foreign countries, which in former years were the major source of supplies for American distributors of foreign hand-made glassware articles, there is no definite way at this time of knowing what the production costs of competitive hand-made glassware articles is or will be in the immediate future in those countries.

In addition, it is of interest to have in mind that millions of dollars worth of the latest American automatic machinery has been installed in these foreign countries, at little or no cost to the operators of such machinery and that their future costs of production will soon be much lower than it has been in former years.

One does not have to be equipped with a college training or recognition as an economist to realize that tariff rates which permit of competitive foreign-made products being delivered into America's market at less than American costs of production would soon result in the closing down of America's factories and unemployment for those American workers dependent upon such factories and workshops for their livelihood.

On the other hand, the American Tariff League which represents several hundred industries was very fair in its brief filed with the committee which stated:

Currently the world's economy is chaotic. The United States is at present engaged, as are other countries, in endeavoring to catch up with a demand for goods created by wartime shortages. We do not have any general surplus for export and it will take considerable time to reconstruct and improve our domestic facilities to meet domestic needs and create an exportable surplus. During this chaotic period, we respectfully submit, it is unwise to complicate the situation still further by a mass revision of our tariff.

Indeed the league believes it is unfair at this particular time to expect domestic producers to furnish to the Committee for Reciprocity Information the kind of statistical and informational material which the Committee ought to have in its work of correlating information about domestic production, imports, foreign costs, etc.

It is quite apparent that Congress should adopt a definite policy in connection with reciprocal trade agreements. It should:

First. Pass a resolution calling for a delay of at least 6 months before any new treaties are entered into, during which time a further study of world conditions could be made.

Second. Pass suitable legislation protecting the key industries of the United States which have helped win two wars.

Third. Provide that treaties would not be extended under the favored-nation clause unless all of the nations that would benefit from such an extension would agree to increase wage rates so that the commodities produced in the foreign countries would be on an equal basis with the commodities produced in this country. A study should be made to determine how far the foreign countries with whom we are to negotiate treaties are going in the nationalization of industries and ascertain the effect that such nationalization will have on the treaties to be executed.

I am including a memorandum entitled "History of Scientific Glassware in America" which, I think, is pertinent to this subject:

HISTORY OF SCIENTIFIC GLASSWARE IN AMERICA

At the time of the Allied embargo in 1914, the manufacturing of scientific glassware in this country was negligible, being limited to small shops working largely on repairs or filling shortages of import orders. Along with certain chemicals, drugs, dyes, and optical glassware, laboratory glassware had, up to this time, been a complete German monopoly.

Unlike the other industries mentioned, for some reason the German firms did not see fit to even establish an American subsidiary for making scientific apparatus. As a result, when the blockade became effective and imports were shut off, there was, in England and America, a real crisis.

England immediately called together her glass manufacturers and scientists and, in addition to establishing and subsidizing a school of glass technology, she placed all scientific glassware under the safeguarding of Key Industries Act.

Late in the spring of 1917 the Council of National Defense called together in Washington a group of American glass manufacturers and from that meeting a new American industry was born.

No promises were extracted, but each plant took upon itself the development of suitable glasses, the training of men, and the necessary capital that was required to meet what would otherwise have been a serious situation, not only to our War Department, but to every major supporting industry requiring the smallest degree of scientific research or control.

At the signing of the armistice, there were at least 15 factories producing blown chemical ware and double that number fabricating and graduating laboratory apparatus.

Early in 1919, before central Europe was in a position to enter the American market, there was a flood of Japanese glassware, which demoralized the entire market. This was so serious that in June 1919, this industry, the importance of which was still fresh in the minds of both our Government officials and scientists, was picked out as one of the few industries that should come under the administration's emergency tariff consideration.

In spite of the Tariff Acts of 1922 and 1930, the industry was carried on by a decreasing

number of plants, who practically subsidized these departments. Until June of 1933, previous to the devaluation of the dollar, imports from Germany, Czechoslovakia, Italy, and Japan were seriously curtailing the American production of this small but important industry.

This industry is highly specialized and requires the highest type of both skilled and unskilled workers and this branch of the glass industry is still considered by the War Department and Public Health Service as one of the critical industries, the supply of which must be assured.

Because it is an industry whose labor cost is the important factor, the controlling element of foreign competition is, therefore, the standard of wages paid in these countries, further amplified by the unstable currency condition in both Europe and the Orient.

At the outbreak of World War II, this industry was in a position to rapidly expand and furnish the Army and Navy medical services, as well as the Public Health Service, with enormous quantities of items that were required in the war effort. Such production would have been impossible if the industry had not been continued after the First World War, as modern science and medicine are entirely dependent upon scientific apparatus.

Mr. Speaker, I close by repeating that whatever ultimate changes it would seem wise to make in our tariff laws, it is, at the very least, necessary to immediately restore to Congress the veto right over agreements negotiated by the executive department, which may be regarded by the Congress as improvident. Congress has no right, in my judgment, to shirk its responsibility in this regard. My bill will again clothe Congress with the power and responsibility which belongs to it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman ought to be complimented for the very splendid statement he is making this afternoon in calling to the attention of the House and the American people the real danger that lies before us insofar as foreign trade is concerned. While we all agree that we ought to do what we can to rehabilitate Europe, we must defend our own industries from this type of foreign competition, particularly from those totalitarian governments that are being established on the continent of Europe and elsewhere, and who are taking over the industries completely and subsidizing them and then later on, through reciprocal arrangements, are hoping to deluge this country with the cheap products of those countries in competition with our own labor.

Mr. HAND. I am in complete accord with what the gentleman has said, Mr. Speaker, and I know he has in mind, among other things, the very disastrous effects that unwise agreements would have on the great fishing industry which he represents and which to a certain extent I represent, together with shoes and textiles.

I am particularly interested in glass, which is particularly vulnerable in the present state of the law. I think if we restore the situation so that Congress can have the final say, the ultimate veto power, so to speak, on these unwise

agreements that may be negotiated, that that will go a long way to solve the problem.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The Committee on Ways and Means has given serious thought to many of those problems in the continuous hearings they have been holding over a period of days and weeks and will continue for some time to come, and I hope from that there will come some solution along the lines suggested, that others will have something to say other than the executive department of the Government.

Mr. HAND. I thank the gentleman. Both the gentleman and I have testified before the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much confusion and so many misstatements with regard to immigration practices, aliens, and displaced persons, that it is time to have the true picture open for inspection by Members of Congress. The State Department, the Department of Justice, and the well-informed are fully aware of the conspiracy of distortion and misrepresentation which has been launched to confuse the public and bedevil Congress on this subject.

Richard C. Raymond, adviser to the Department of State on displaced persons, recently stated:

We are concerned about a lot of false propaganda that is going around about the displaced persons. There is so much of it that there almost seems to be a campaign behind it.

In the last issue of the Monthly Review of the Immigration and Naturalization Service—March 1947—Commissioner Carusi exposes some of the false stories about immigration in an editorial entitled "Rumor Versus Fact."

Earlier this year Earl Harrison, former Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, said:

Right now, there seems to have been launched a campaign of misrepresentation and distortion concerning immigration into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to disclose and expose this campaign of misrepresentation and to take up point by point each count of this conspiracy of distortion.

Count 1 of the conspiracy consists of the false propaganda that hundreds of thousands, and even millions, of refugees are entering the country illegally. A reputable news magazine recently stated that illegal entries were skyrocketing, that foreigners caught entering the country under false pretenses are now at a rate of 170,000 a year, and it implied that this number consisted entirely of refugees. There have also been newspaper editorials and articles which have been repeated and spread upon the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the effect that 2,000 aliens enter the country illegally

every day. And here again an attempt is made to convey the thought that these are refugees seeking illegal entry into the United States from European shores. Commissioner Carusi answers this oft-repeated falsehood as follows:

Rumors repeatedly infer that millions of European refugees are crossing our borders illegally. These rumors may stem from the fact that many Mexicans are illegally crossing the southern border of the United States in quest of work. These illegal Mexican entrants are being apprehended and returned to Mexico by the immigration border patrol at the rate of 15,000 per month. If we may judge from protests that we are receiving from the area along the Mexican border, our expulsions of Mexicans are depleting the labor supply to an extent which may exceed the current rate of illegal entries. Be that as it may, these people are neither Europeans nor refugees. Attempted illegal entries from the European area are less than 100 per month; most of these aliens are stowaways who arrive on vessels in groups of from 2 to 10. Practically every one of these stowaways is apprehended by the captain of the vessel before he reaches port and is then turned over to our officers at the pier. They are being returned whence they came by the steamship companies which brought them.

Count 2 of the conspiracy is that all displaced persons of Europe are riffraff and undesirable.

There are approximately 850,000 displaced persons in the various zones in Europe. Of these, more than 50 percent are women and children. There are 150,000 children below the age of 17, and of these 70,000 are estimated to be under 6 years of age. There are 77,000 farm hands among the displaced, some 20,000 housemaids, and 18,000 construction workers. Many are skilled workers, some are professionals, and others are business people. An investigation of these displaced persons, set forth in a House Military Affairs report, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, House Report 2740, states:

The great majority of them are law-abiding and sincerely grateful to the United States.

Count 3 of the conspiracy is the attempt to paint all displaced persons as Communists. Richard C. Raymond, adviser on displaced persons in the State Department, stated in this connection on February 1, 1947, as follows:

A current report stated that there would be many Communists among them and that they would constitute a grave danger. To anyone who has lived among these people and knows them, this is simply not so, for they are thoroughly unsympathetic to communism.

And this is what Commissioner Carusi has to say about the same subject:

As to those having foreign political philosophies the law requires the exclusion on political grounds of persons who are anarchist or who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States, or of all forms of law, or who disbelieve in or are opposed to organized government, or who advocate certain specified acts consistent with these prescribed doctrines. Any immigrant who falls within one of these classes is ordered excluded.

In passing I ask: Could it be that the charges of the professional alarmists

against more liberal immigration and the admission of the displaced are inspired by the Communists themselves? They want the displaced turned over to Russia and Russian-dominated countries. They would like to see the failure of the President's program for the displaced of Europe. Members of Congress owe it to themselves to ascertain the sources of these falsely inspired rumors. Let us not have the immigration question confused and divided by the Communists. Let all those who repeat these false charges pay heed lest they innocently front for the Communist Party-line on the refugee problem.

These displaced persons prized freedom deeply enough to have suffered for it. They are presently in detention camps because they refuse to return to Communist-dominated lands and to countries where growing racial and political persecution has taken hold. They are today resisting as they have in the past all forms of totalitarianism. Our democratic way of life was born on European shores among oppressed displaced people and was first brought here on the *Mayflower*. Today's displaced people of Europe are worthy successors to the Pilgrims.

Count 4 of the conspiracy is the attempt to make a Jewish issue out of the problem of immigration, to convey the thought that most of the displaced persons are Jewish, and to fan the flames of anti-Semitism and racial hatred. This would be despicable even if all the displaced persons of Europe were Jewish, which is not the case. It is even more contemptible because of the attempt to mingle race prejudice with malicious falsehoods. Eighty percent of the displaced persons are of the Catholic and Protestant faith. And religious organizations of these faiths are solidly behind the movement to take our fair share of the displaced persons of Europe. Only 20 percent of the displaced are of the Jewish faith and of these an overwhelming majority desire to emigrate to Palestine, and not to the United States.

On this subject, Commissioner Carusi says:

Other rumors imply that large proportions of those persons who are admitted to the United States are of one faith * * *. A preponderance of immigrants from any one religious faith is a matter of chance influenced by economic or other factors which may persuade particular groups to migrate to the United States at any given time. Such a preponderance, if it occurs, is not a violation of law nor does any alien's religious affiliation bear upon his admissibility into this country.

Count 5 of the conspiracy is the attempt to disparage refugees who are lawfully in the United States and to describe them as criminals and Communists. The short answer to that is the statement of J. Edgar Hoover, made during the war years. He stated that "the experience of the FBI in coping with foreign agents, spies, and saboteurs has conclusively illustrated that the great mass of aliens are loyal to the United States, devoted to the principles of democracy." And all those who have ever made any studies on the subject of immigration and crime have concluded that the over-

whelming majority of aliens in the United States are law abiding.

Count 6 of the conspiracy is the double barreled falsehood that there are a million veterans unemployed and that the immigration of displaced persons will result in aggravating this unemployment problem. It is true that more than a million veterans were drawing veteran's unemployment compensation. On the other hand statistics show that not more than 80,000 drew benefits for any sustained period. At the same time, Department of Labor statistics disclosed that there were critical manpower shortages in agricultural workers, certain types of medical personnel, construction workers, and domestics. It is an economic fact fully supported in a recent booklet entitled *Economic Aspects of Immigration* published by the National Committee on Immigration Policy, that immigrants do not take jobs away from veterans or other Americans.

The bulk of the displaced persons are workers. As I previously stated, there are some 77,000 farm hands among them; some 20,000 are housemaids. Many are skilled workers; some are professionals; others still are business people. There is a great shortage of farm labor and domestic service in the United States. New immigrants who are not workers tend to open noncompetitive business shops. A recent study in a metropolitan city showed that each refugee entrepreneur in business created a job for seven Americans. The largest labor unions in our country, the CIO and the A. F. of L. representing over 13,000,000 workers, are on record as favoring the admission of displaced persons. As stated in recent testimony by a Department of Justice representative, "a great number of immigrants, both quota and nonquota, are not within the competitive field of employment." Many of the displaced are women and children. The small number admitted in proportion to our total population cannot create a serious unemployment problem and it should be remembered that all immigrants are consumers.

Count 7 of the conspiracy is the inspired falsification that a regular swarm of persons from Europe has been and is now coming into this country. It has been said that the present influx is seven times the immigration rate during the depression years of the early thirties, and greater than any year since 1929. What are the facts?

In 1929 the United States Congress passed immigration laws permitting 153,000 quota immigrants to enter the country annually. During the war years, from 1940 to 1946 only 15 percent of the total world quota was used. Nine hundred and fourteen thousand seven hundred and sixty-two people who could have entered the United States legally under quotas did not do so. In the fiscal year ended 1946 only 29,095 quota immigrants entered. Is this greater than the number who entered any year since 1929 or during the depression years of the early thirties? I merely call your attention to the fact that in 1930, 141,497 quota immigrants entered the United States and in each of the five additional years the admissions have exceeded the

number who entered during the last fiscal year 1946.

These are the major counts of the conspiracy which has taken shape to distort and confuse the picture of immigration and displaced persons. It is interesting to observe that many of those who have been misled are the first to cry for the expenditure of moneys to investigate rumors they helped spread when by mere contact with administrative officials the true facts can be ascertained.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we should do something about the displaced persons of Europe. Our program should be guided by full knowledge of the facts and not by blind prejudice, false rumors or propaganda which seeks to hinder and obstruct action by the United States.

H. R. 2910, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois on April 1, 1947, authorizes the admission to the United States of 100,000 displaced persons in each of four emergency years. It will, if enacted into law, recapture only in part the unused war quotas. The principal of this bill has been endorsed by more than 100 separate organizations. Religious groups, labor and civic organizations, and some veteran groups, have all gone on record as favoring the admission of our fair share of the displaced persons of Europe.

In conclusion, I call attention to Barry Bingham's keen analysis of the displaced persons problem in the Courier Journal of Louisville, Ky. We might well weigh these words:

There are four courses which America might pursue in dealing with this human problem. One is to let the DP's stay forever in former concentration camps, at a cost of \$300,000,000 a year to the American taxpayer. Another is to abandon them and let them starve. A third is to try to force them on other countries, while insisting that we ourselves can give shelter to none of them in the United States. The fourth is to take the lead in distributing them among various nations by offering to take a limited number into this country.

The first two solutions seem out of the question, as too expensive and too brutal. The third is the course we have been tacitly following, though we have never officially adopted it and it is not sanctioned by any of our responsible leaders. It has produced no results to date, for almost none of the DP's have been resettled in new countries.

The fourth solution has both logic and humanity on its side, but unfortunately creates an emotional block in many American minds. The Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons has proposed admitting 400,000, more than half of whom are women and children under 18.

Mr. Speaker, there are eminently practical reasons for America to take the lead in placing the displaced persons. General McNarney, the commanding general of our military forces in Europe, has said that our occupation troops in Germany could be cut sharply if the DP's were moved out of the country. At present they are a dead expense on our hands.

The moral reasons for coming to their rescue hardly need recital. One of the proudest of American traditions lies in the fact that this country gave harbor to the victims of religious and political persecution. The Pilgrim Fathers came to our shores for those very reasons. The

same impetus sent thousands of German families to American shores after the revolution of 1848, and our country has had few more useful citizens. America was built by refugees from foreign lands. Is it any wonder that the world looks to us today for an act of leadership?

I commend to your attention H. R. 2910, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRATTON]. This bill would permit the admission into this country of 100,000 DP's in each of four emergency years. It deserves your support and I trust that the Members will support it, both in committee and on the floor.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in the United States in 1947; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 736. An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 30, 1947, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

611. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the effective operation and expansion of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

612. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize leases on real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other reasons; to the Committee on Armed Services.

613. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of \$140,000 for the legislative branch, House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 224); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

614. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of \$21,500 for the legislative branch, Office of Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office (H. Doc. No. 225); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

615. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1947 amounting to \$466,000 (H. Doc. No. 226); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

616. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 and prior years in the amount of \$95,089.24, and supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of \$259,500 for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 227); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

617. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to repeal the laws relating to the length of tours of duty of officers and enlisted men of the Army at certain foreign stations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

618. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 4, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Parkers Creek, Calvert County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

619. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 4, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Petoskey Harbor, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

620. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 12, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Danvers River, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 13, 1939; to the Committee on Public Works.

621. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 6, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Big Kingston Creek, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

622. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 3, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Bear Creek and Lynch Cove, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3245. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 200. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3203, a bill relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 324). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 183. Resolution to provide for a Coordinator of Information for the House of Representatives; with amendments (Rept. No. 325). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 3245. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan (by request):

H. R. 3246. A bill to modify the requirements relating to life-saving appliances on passenger vessels navigating the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3247. A bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROPHY:

H. R. 3248. A bill to discontinue in effect certain war excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 3249. A bill to provide for a statutory award of 10 percent to any war veteran who was wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by an instrumentality of war in a zone of hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. R. 3250. A bill to provide for the full and effective utilization of the personnel of the Panama Canal, Canal Zone, and Panama Railroad Company without discrimination; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3251. A bill to amend the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, so as to authorize naval retiring boards to consider the cases of certain officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3252. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Long Beach, Calif., for street purposes an easement in certain lands within the Navy housing project at Long Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3253. A bill to authorize the allowance of leave credit to officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and the Reserve components thereof who were denied such credit as the result of certain changes in their status between September 8, 1939, and August 9, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3254. A bill to provide additional inducements to physicians and surgeons to make a career of the United States naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 3255. A bill to provide for preferences under the immigration quotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3256. A bill to provide for a Resident Commissioner to the United States from the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 3257. A bill to create a National Cancer Research Commission in order to provide for and coordinate research in an endeavor to discover the cause or causes of cancer and means for its prevention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3258. A bill to provide that rentals from certain temporary housing projects shall accrue to the educational institution or State or political subdivision thereof charged with the maintenance of such housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GARY:

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that Congress shall fill any vacancy occurring in the office of Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to authorize conversion of Federal savings and loan associations into State savings and loan or building and loan associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make 1948 appropriations for flood-control projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXI, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 3259. A bill for the relief of Tsuyoshi Matsumoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 3260. A bill for the relief of Clarence S. Osika; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 3261. A bill for the relief of Capt. Carroll C. Garretson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3262. A bill for the relief of Marjorie Maloy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3263. A bill for the relief of Tech. Sgt. Tsuyoshi Matsumoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

394. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. Ora L. Leslie and 49 other residents of

Beloit, Kans., and vicinity, urging the enactment of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

395. By Mr. SCRIVNER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, concerning unemployment compensation and employment service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

396. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, concerning legislation to place residents of the non-community-property States on a parity with those of community-property States with respect to Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

397. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, concerning amendment to the provisions of the Federal income-tax law to permit deductions of amounts expended in connection with the research and development of new products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

398. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, concerning enactment of legislation providing for conservation payments for the benefit of stripper wells, thereby preventing the premature abandonment thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

399. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of Wisconsin Society of Certified Public Accountants adopted at a meeting of the board of directors on April 21, 1947, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of legislation to end income-tax burden of the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

400. Also, Joint Resolution 32A of the State of Wisconsin, petitioning the Congress to amend the social-security law relative to persons in public institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

401. Also, Joint Resolution 31A of the State of Wisconsin, relating to petitioning Congress to raise the amount of personal exemptions on Federal taxation of incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

402. By the SPEAKER: Petition of members of Malden Townsend Club, No. 1, Malden, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

403. Also, petition of Local 166, United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America (CIO), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for investigation of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.'s behavior during strike; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

404. Also, petition of the Council of the City of Toledo, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging Congress not to pass legislation which is unnecessarily repressive to either labor or management; to the Committee on Education and Labor.